

Proof theory of weak compactness

Toshiyasu Arai

Graduate School of Science, Chiba University
1-33, Yayoi-cho, Inage-ku, Chiba, 263-8522, JAPAN
tosarai@faculty.chiba-u.jp

Abstract

We show that the existence of a weakly compact cardinal over the Zermelo-Fraenkel's set theory $\mathbf{ZF}$ is proof-theoretically reducible to iterations of Mostowski collapsings and Mahlo operations.

1 Introduction

It is well known that a cardinal is weakly compact iff it is Π_1^1 -indescribable. From this characterization we see readily that the set of Mahlo cardinals below a weakly compact cardinal is stationary, i.e., any weakly compact cardinal is hyper Mahlo. Furthermore any weakly compact cardinal κ is in the diagonal intersection $\kappa \in M^\Delta = \bigcap \{M(M^\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa\}$ for the α -th iterate M^α of the Mahlo operation M : for classes X of ordinals,

$$\kappa \in M(X) :\Leftrightarrow X \cap \kappa \text{ is stationary in } \kappa \Leftrightarrow \forall Y \subset \kappa [(Y \text{ is club}) \rightarrow X \cap Y \neq \emptyset].$$

Note that $\kappa \in M(X)$ is Π_1^1 on V_κ .

On the other side R. Jensen [11] showed under the axiom $V = L$ of constructibility that for regular cardinals κ , κ is weakly compact iff $\forall X \subset \kappa [\kappa \in M(X) \Rightarrow M(X) \cap \kappa \neq \emptyset]$ iff $\forall X \subset \kappa [\kappa \in M(X) \Rightarrow \kappa \in M(M(X))]$.

Jensen's proof in [11] yields a normal form theorem of Π_1^1 -formulae on $L_\kappa = J_\kappa$ uniformly for regular uncountable cardinals κ as follows.

For a first order formula $\varphi[D]$ with unary predicates A, D , let

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \in S^\varphi(A) &:\Leftrightarrow \text{there exists a limit } \beta \text{ such that } \alpha < \beta < \alpha^+, A \cap \alpha \in J_\beta, \\ \langle J_\beta, \in, A \cap \alpha \rangle &\models \forall D \subset \alpha \varphi[D], \alpha \text{ is regular in } \beta \text{ and} \\ \exists p \in J_\beta \forall X &[(p \cup \{\alpha\} \subset X \prec J_\beta) \wedge (X \cap \alpha \text{ is transitive}) \Rightarrow X = J_\beta] \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where α is regular in β iff there is no cofinal function from a smaller ordinal $< \alpha$ into α , which is definable on J_β .

The following Proposition 1.1 is the Lemma 5.2 in [11].

Proposition 1.1 *Let $\alpha \in S^\varphi(A)$ and β be an ordinal as in the definition of $S^\varphi(A)$. Then α is Σ_1 -singular in $\beta + 1$, i.e., there exists a cofinal function from a smaller ordinal $< \alpha$ into α , which is Σ_1 -definable on $J_{\beta+1}$.*

Fix a regular uncountable cardinal κ , a set $A \subset \kappa$. For a finite set $\{A, \dots\}$ of subsets $A, \dots$ of κ and ordinals $\alpha < \kappa$, let $N_\alpha(A, \dots)$ denote the least Σ_1 -elementary submodel of J_{κ^+} , $N_\alpha(A, \dots) \prec_{\Sigma_1} J_{\kappa^+}$, such that $\alpha \cup \{A, \dots\} \cup \{\kappa\} \subset N_\alpha(A, \dots)$. Namely $N_\alpha(A, \dots)$ is the Σ_1 -Skolem hull $\text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^{J_{\kappa^+}}(\alpha \cup \{A, \dots\} \cup \{\kappa\})$ of $\alpha \cup \{A, \dots\} \cup \{\kappa\}$ on J_{κ^+} . Let

$$C(A, \dots) := \{\alpha < \kappa : N_\alpha(A, \dots) \cap \kappa \subset \alpha\}.$$

Then it is easy to see that $C(A, \dots)$ is club in κ , and definable over J_{κ^+} .

Proposition 1.2 *Let κ be a regular uncountable cardinal, $A \subset \kappa$, $\varphi[D]$ a first order formula with parameters A, D .*

1. *Suppose $\langle J_{\kappa^+}, \in, A \rangle \models \forall D \subset \kappa \varphi[D]$, and let C be a club subset of κ . Then the least element of the club set $C(A, C)$ is in $S^\varphi(A)$.*
2. *Suppose $\langle J_{\kappa^+}, \in, A \rangle \not\models \forall D \subset \kappa \varphi[D]$, then $S^\varphi(A) \cap C(A) = \emptyset$.*

Thus $\langle J_{\kappa^+}, \in, A \rangle \models \forall D \subset \kappa \varphi[D]$ iff $S^\varphi(A)$ is stationary in κ . And κ is weakly compact iff for any stationary subset $S \subset \kappa$ there exists an uncountable regular cardinal $\alpha < \kappa$ such that $S \cap \alpha$ is stationary in α .

Proof. 1.2.1. Suppose $\langle J_{\kappa^+}, \in, A \rangle \models \forall D \subset \kappa \varphi[D]$, and let C be a club subset of κ . Consider the club subset $C(A, C)$ of κ . Then $C(A, C) \subset C$. We show that $\alpha \in S^\varphi(A)$ for the least element α of $C(A, C)$. Let $\pi : \langle J_\beta, \in, A \cap \alpha, C \cap \alpha \rangle \cong N_\alpha(A, C) \prec_{\Sigma_1} J_{\kappa^+}$ be the transitive collapse of $N_\alpha(A, C)$. β is a limit ordinal with $\alpha < \beta < \alpha^+$. From $\langle J_{\kappa^+}, \in, A \rangle \models \forall D \subset \kappa \varphi[D]$ we see $\langle J_\beta, \in, A \cap \alpha \rangle \models \forall D \subset \alpha \varphi[D]$, and $A \cap \alpha, C \cap \alpha \in J_\beta$ from $A, C \in N_\alpha(A, C)$. It remains to show (1) for $p = \{A \cap \alpha, C \cap \alpha\}$. Assume $\{A \cap \alpha, C \cap \alpha, \alpha\} \subset X \prec J_\beta$ and $X \cap \alpha = \gamma$ for an ordinal $\gamma \leq \alpha$. Then $\gamma \cup \{A, C, \kappa\} \subset \pi'' X \prec N_\alpha(A, C) \prec_{\Sigma_1} J_{\kappa^+}$. This yields $N_\gamma(A, C) \prec_{\Sigma_1} \pi'' X$, and $N_\gamma(A, C) \cap \kappa \subset (\pi'' X) \cap \kappa = \pi''(X \cap \alpha) = \gamma$ by $N_\alpha(A, C) \cap \kappa \subset \alpha$. This means that $\gamma \in C(A, C)$, and hence $X \cap \alpha = \gamma = \alpha$. Therefore $\pi'' X = N_\alpha(A, C)$, and $X = J_\beta$.

1.2.2. Suppose $\langle J_{\kappa^+}, \in, A \rangle \not\models \forall D \subset \kappa \varphi[D]$. Assume $\alpha \in S^\varphi(A) \cap C(A)$. Let $\langle J_{\bar{\beta}}, \in, A \cap \alpha \rangle \cong N_\alpha(A) \prec_{\Sigma_1} J_{\kappa^+}$ be the transitive collapse of $N_\alpha(A)$. Then $\langle J_{\bar{\beta}}, \in, A \cap \alpha \rangle \not\models \forall D \subset \alpha \varphi[D]$. On the other hand we have by $\alpha \in S^\varphi(A)$, there exists a limit β such that $\langle J_\beta, \in, A \cap \alpha \rangle \models \forall D \subset \alpha \varphi[D]$, and α is Σ_1 -singular in $\beta+1$ by Proposition 1.1. Hence $\beta < \bar{\beta}$ and α is Σ_1 -singular in $\bar{\beta}$. This means that κ is Σ_1 -singular in κ^+ . However κ is assumed to be regular. A contradiction. $\square$

In this paper we show that the existence of a weakly compact cardinal over the Zermelo-Fraenkel's set theory ZF is proof-theoretically reducible to iterations of Mostowski collapsings and Mahlo operations.

Let $\mathbb{K}$ denote the formula stating that 'there exists a weakly compact cardinal $\mathcal{K}$ '.

For Σ_2^1 -sentences $\varphi \equiv \exists Y \forall X \theta$, let φ^{V_κ} be $\exists Y \subset V_\kappa \forall X \subset V_\kappa \theta^{V_\kappa}$ where θ^a denotes the result of restricting any unbounded quantifiers $\exists x, \forall x$ to $\exists x \in a, \forall x \in a$, resp.

Theorem 1.3 *There are Σ_{n+1} -formulae $\theta_n(x)$ for which the following holds:*

1. *For each $n < \omega$,*

$$\text{ZF} + (V = L) \vdash \forall \mathcal{K} [\mathcal{K} \text{ is a weakly compact cardinal} \rightarrow \theta_n(\mathcal{K})]$$

and

$$\text{ZF} + (V = L) \vdash \forall \mathcal{K} [\theta_{n+1}(\mathcal{K}) \rightarrow \mathcal{K} \in M(\{\pi < \mathcal{K} : \theta_n(\pi)\})].$$

2. *For any Σ_2^1 -sentences φ , if*

$$\text{ZF} \vdash \forall \mathcal{K} [\mathcal{K} \text{ is a weakly compact cardinal} \rightarrow \varphi^{V_{\mathcal{K}}}],$$

then we can find an $n < \omega$ such that

$$\text{ZF} + (V = L) \vdash \forall \mathcal{K} [\theta_n(\mathcal{K}) \rightarrow \varphi^{V_{\mathcal{K}}}].$$

Hence $\text{ZF} + (V = L) + (\mathcal{K} \text{ is weakly compact})$ is $\Sigma_2^1(\mathcal{K})$ -conservative over $\text{ZF} + (V = L) + \{\theta_n(\mathcal{K}) : n < \omega\}$, and $\text{ZF} + (V = L) + \mathbb{K}$ is conservative over $\text{ZF} + (V = L) + \{\exists \mathcal{K} \theta_n(\mathcal{K}) : n < \omega\}$, e.g., with respect to first-order sentences $\varphi^{V_{I_0}}$ for the least weakly inaccessible cardinal I_0 .

Note that $T_n = \text{ZF} + (V = L) + \{\exists \mathcal{K} \theta_n(\mathcal{K})\}$ is weaker than $\text{ZF} + \mathbb{K}$, e.g., $\text{ZF} + \mathbb{K}$ proves the existence of a model of T_n for each $n < \omega$.

The Σ_{n+1} -formulae $\theta_n(x)$ are defined by

$$\theta_n(x) :\Leftrightarrow x \in Mh_n^{\omega_n(I+1)}.$$

The Σ_{n+1} -class Mh_n^ξ for ordinals ξ is defined through iterations of Mostowski collapsings and Mahlo operations, cf. Definition 2.2.

Let us explain some backgrounds of this paper. Π_3 -reflecting ordinals are known to be recursive analogues to weakly compact cardinals. Proof theory (*ordinal analysis*) of Π_3 -reflection has been done by M. Rathjen [12], and [1, 3–5].

As observed in [3, 6], ordinal analyses of Π_{N+1} -reflection yield a proof-theoretic reduction of Π_{N+1} -reflection in terms of iterations of Π_N -recursively Mahlo operations. Specifically we show the following Theorem 1.4 in [8]. Let $\text{KP}\omega$ denote the Kripke-Platek set theory with the axiom of Infinity, $\Pi_N(a)$ a universal Π_N -formula, and $RM_N(\mathcal{X})$ the Π_N -recursively Mahlo operation for classes of transitive sets $\mathcal{X}$:

$$P \in RM_N(\mathcal{X}) \quad :\Leftrightarrow \quad \forall b \in P [P \models \Pi_N(b) \rightarrow \exists Q \in \mathcal{X} \cap P (Q \models \Pi_N(b))]$$

(read: P is Π_N -reflecting on $\mathcal{X}$.)

The iteration of RM_N along a definable relation $\prec$ is defined as follows.

$$P \in RM_N(a; \prec) :\Leftrightarrow a \in P \in \bigcap \{RM_N(RM_N(b; \prec)) : b \in P \models b \prec a\}.$$

Let $<^\varepsilon$ be a Δ_1 -predicate such that for any transitive and wellfounded model V of $\text{KP}\omega$, $<^\varepsilon$ is a canonical well ordering of type $\varepsilon_{\mathcal{K}+1}$ for the order type $\mathcal{K}$ of the class Ord of ordinals in V . $[\omega_n(\mathcal{K} + 1)]$ denotes the code of the ‘ordinal’ $\omega_n(\mathcal{K} + 1)$

Theorem 1.4 *For each $N \geq 2$, KPII_{N+1} is Π_{N+1} -conservative over the theory*

$$\text{KP}\omega + \{V \in \text{RM}_N(\lceil \omega_n(\mathcal{K} + 1) \rceil; <^\varepsilon) : n \in \omega\}.$$

On the other side, we [7] have lifted up the ordinal analysis of recursively inaccessible ordinals in [10] to one of weakly inaccessible cardinals. This paper aims to lift up [12] and [6] to the weak compactness.

Let us mention the contents of this paper. In the next section 2 iterated Skolem hulls $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(X)$ of sets X of ordinals, ordinals $\Psi_{\kappa,n}\gamma$ for regular ordinals κ ($\mathcal{K} < \kappa \leq I$), and classes $Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta]$ are defined for finite sets Θ of ordinals. It is shown that for each $n, m < \omega$, $\mathcal{K} \in Mh_n^{\omega_m(I+1)}$ in $\text{ZF} + (V = L) + \mathbb{K}$. In the third section 3 we introduce a theory for weakly compact cardinals, which are equivalent to $\text{ZF} + (V = L) + \mathbb{K}$.

In the section 4 cut inferences are eliminated from operator controlled derivations of Σ_2^1 -sentences $\varphi^{V\kappa}$ over $\mathcal{K}$, and $\varphi^{V\kappa}$ is shown to be true. Everything up to this is seen to be formalizable in $\text{ZF} + (V = L) + \{\theta_n(\mathcal{K}) : n \in \omega\}$. Hence the Theorem 1.3 follows in the final section 5.

2 Ordinals for weakly compact cardinals

In this section iterated Skolem hulls $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(X)$ of sets X of ordinals, ordinals $\Psi_{\kappa,n}\gamma$ for regular ordinals κ ($\mathcal{K} < \kappa \leq I$), and classes $Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta]$ are defined for finite sets Θ of ordinals. It is shown that for each $n, m < \omega$, $\mathcal{K} \in Mh_n^{\omega_m(I+1)}$ in $\text{ZF} + (V = L) + \mathbb{K}$.

Reg denotes the set of uncountable regular ordinals below the least weakly inaccessible cardinal I above $\mathcal{K}$, while $R := \text{Reg} \cap \{\rho : \mathcal{K} < \rho < I\}$ and $R^+ := R \cup \{I\}$. $\kappa, \lambda, \rho, \pi$ denote elements of R . κ^+ denotes the least regular ordinal above κ . Θ denotes finite sets of ordinals $\leq \mathcal{K}$. $\Theta \subset_{fin} X$ iff Θ is a finite subset of X . *Ord* denotes the class of ordinals less than I , while Ord^ε the class of ordinals less than the next epsilon number ε_{I+1} to I .

For admissible ordinals σ and $X \subset L_\sigma$, $\text{Hull}_{\Sigma_n}^\sigma(X)$ denotes the Σ_n -Skolem hull of X over L_σ , cf. [7]. $F = F^{\Sigma_n}(y; \sigma, X)$ denotes the Mostowski collapsing $F : \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_n}^\sigma(X) \leftrightarrow L_\gamma$ of $\text{Hull}_{\Sigma_n}^\sigma(X)$ for a γ . When $\sigma = I$, we write $F_X^{\Sigma_n}(y)$ for $F^{\Sigma_n}(y; I, X)$.

In what follows $n \geq 1$ denotes a fixed positive integer.

Define simultaneously by recursion on ‘ordinals’ $\alpha < \varepsilon_{I+1}$, the classes $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(X) \subset L_{\varepsilon_{I+1}}(X \subset \text{Ord}^\varepsilon)$, and the ordinals $\Psi_{\kappa,n}\alpha$ ($\kappa \in R^+$) as follows.

$\mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}$ is an operator in the sense defined below.

Definition 2.1 By an *operator* we mean a map $\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H} : \mathcal{P}(\text{Ord}^\varepsilon) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(L_{\varepsilon_{I+1}})$, such that

1. $\forall X \subset \text{Ord}^\varepsilon [X \subset \mathcal{H}(X)].$

2. $\forall X, Y \subset Ord^\varepsilon [Y \subset \mathcal{H}(X) \Rightarrow \mathcal{H}(Y) \subset \mathcal{H}(X)]$.

For an operator $\mathcal{H}$ and $\Theta, \Lambda \subset Ord^\varepsilon$, $\mathcal{H}[\Theta](X) := \mathcal{H}(X \cup \Theta)$, and $\mathcal{H}[\Theta][\Lambda] := (\mathcal{H}[\Theta])[\Lambda]$, i.e., $\mathcal{H}[\Theta][\Lambda](X) = \mathcal{H}(X \cup \Theta \cup \Lambda)$.

Obviously $\mathcal{H}[\Theta]$ is an operator.

Definition 2.2 $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(X)$ is a Skolem hull of $\{0, \mathcal{K}, I\} \cup X$ under the functions $+, \alpha \mapsto \omega^\alpha, \kappa \mapsto \kappa^+ (\kappa \in R), \Psi_{\kappa,n} \upharpoonright \alpha (\kappa \in R^+)$, the Skolem hullings:

$$X \mapsto \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_n}^I(X \cap I)$$

and the Mostowski collapsing functions

$$x = \Psi_{\kappa,n} \gamma \mapsto F_{x \cup \{\kappa\}}^{\Sigma_1} (\kappa \in R)$$

and

$$x = \Psi_{I,n} \gamma \mapsto F_x^{\Sigma_n}$$

1. (Inductive definition of $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(X)$).

- (a) $\{0, \mathcal{K}, I\} \cup X \subset \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(X)$.
- (b) $x, y \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(X) \Rightarrow x + y, \omega^x \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(X)$.
- (c) $\kappa \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(X) \cap (\{\mathcal{K}\} \cup R) \Rightarrow \kappa^+ \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(X)$.
- (d) $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(X) \cap \alpha \Rightarrow \Psi_{I,n} \gamma \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(X)$.
- (e) If $\kappa \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(X) \cap R$, $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(X) \cap \alpha$ and $\kappa \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}(\kappa)$, then $\Psi_{\kappa,n} \gamma \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(X)$.
- (f)

$$\text{Hull}_{\Sigma_n}^I(\mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(X) \cap L_I) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(X).$$

Namely for any Σ_n -formula $\varphi[x, \vec{y}]$ in the language $\{\in\}$ and parameters $\vec{a} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(X) \cap L_I$, if $b \in L_I$, $L_I \models \varphi[b, \vec{a}]$ and $L_I \models \exists! x \varphi[x, \vec{a}]$, then $b \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(X)$.

- (g) If $\kappa \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(X) \cap R$, $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(X) \cap \alpha$, $x = \Psi_{\kappa,n} \gamma \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(X)$, $\kappa \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}(\kappa)$ and $\delta \in (\text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(x \cup \{\kappa\}) \cup \{I\}) \cap \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(X)$, then $F_{x \cup \{\kappa\}}^{\Sigma_1}(\delta) \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(X)$.
- (h) If $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(X) \cap \alpha$, $x = \Psi_{I,n} \gamma \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(X)$, and $\delta \in (\text{Hull}_{\Sigma_n}^I(x) \cup \{I\}) \cap \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(X)$, then $F_x^{\Sigma_n}(\delta) \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(X)$.

2. (Definition of $\Psi_{\kappa,n}\alpha$).

Assume $\kappa \in R^+$ and $\kappa \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(\kappa)$. Then

$$\Psi_{\kappa,n}\alpha := \min\{\beta < \kappa : \kappa \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(\beta), \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(\beta) \cap \kappa \subset \beta\}.$$

The classes $Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta]$ are defined for $n < \omega$, $\alpha < \varepsilon_{I+1}$, and $\Theta \subset_{fin} (\mathcal{K} + 1)$.

Definition 2.3 ($Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta]$)

Let $\Theta \subset_{fin} (\mathcal{K} + 1)$ and $\mathcal{K} \geq \pi \in Reg$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \pi \in Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta] &: \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(\pi) \cap \mathcal{K} \subset \pi \ \& \ \alpha \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}[\Theta](\pi) \\ &\& \ \forall \xi \in \mathcal{H}_{\xi,n}[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}](\pi) \cap \alpha [\pi \in M(Mh_n^\xi[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}])] \end{aligned}$$

where $\forall \xi \in \mathcal{H}_{\xi,n}[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}](\pi) \cap \alpha[\dots]$ is a short hand for $\forall \xi < \alpha [\xi \in \mathcal{H}_{\xi,n}[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}](\pi) \cap \alpha \rightarrow \dots]$.

$$Mh_n^\alpha := Mh_n^\alpha[\{\mathcal{K}\}] = Mh_n^\alpha[\emptyset].$$

In the following Proposition 2.4, let Ord^ε and $<^\varepsilon$ are Δ -predicates such that for any wellfounded model M of $KP\omega$, $<^\varepsilon$ is a well ordering of type ε_{I+1} on Ord^ε for the order type I of the class Ord in M . $[\omega_n(I+1)] \in Ord^\varepsilon$ denotes the code of the ‘ordinal’ $\omega_n(I+1)$, which is assumed to be a closed ‘term’ built from the code $[I]$ and n , e.g., $[\alpha] = \langle 0, \alpha \rangle$ for $\alpha \in Ord$, $[I] = \langle 1, 0 \rangle$ and $[\omega_n(I+1)] = \langle 2, \langle 2, \dots \langle 2, \langle 3, [I], \langle 0, 1 \rangle \rangle \dots \rangle \rangle$.

$<^\varepsilon$ is assumed to be a canonical ordering such that $KP\omega$ proves the fact that $<^\varepsilon$ is a linear ordering, and for any formula φ and each $n < \omega$,

$$KP\omega \vdash \forall x (\forall y <^\varepsilon x \ \varphi(y) \rightarrow \varphi(x)) \rightarrow \forall x <^\varepsilon [\omega_n(\mathcal{K} + 1)] \varphi(x) \quad (2)$$

The following Propositions 2.4 and 2.5 are easy to see.

Proposition 2.4 *Each of $x = \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(\beta)$ ($\alpha \in Ord^\varepsilon, \beta < I$), $\beta = \Psi_{\kappa,n}\alpha$ ($\kappa \in R^+$) and $x = Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta]$ is a Σ_{n+1} -predicate as fixed points in $ZF + (V = L)$.*

Proposition 2.5 $(\alpha, y) \mapsto \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}[\Theta](y)$ is weakly monotonic in the sense that

$$\alpha \leq \alpha' \wedge y \subset y' \wedge x = \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}[\Theta](y) \wedge x' = \mathcal{H}_{\alpha',n}[\Theta](y') \rightarrow x \subset x'.$$

Also $(\alpha, y) \mapsto \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}[\Theta](y)$ is continuous in the sense that if $\alpha = \sup_{i \in I} \alpha_i$ is a limit ordinal with an increasing sequence $\{\alpha_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $y = \bigcup_{j \in J} y_j$ with a directed system $\{y_j\}_{j \in J}$, then

$$x = \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}[\Theta](\beta) \wedge \forall i \in I \forall j \in J (x_{i,j} = \mathcal{H}_{\alpha_i,n}[\Theta](y_j)) \rightarrow x = \bigcup_{i \in I, j \in J} x_{i,j}.$$

Let $A_n(\alpha)$ denote the conjunction of $\forall \beta < I \exists! x [x = \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(\beta)]$, $\forall \kappa \in R^+ \forall x [\kappa \in x = \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(\kappa) \rightarrow \exists! \beta (\beta = \Psi_{\kappa,n}\alpha)]$ and $\forall \Theta \subset_{fin} (\mathcal{K} + 1) \exists! x [x = Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta]]$.

The Σ_{n+1} -formula $\theta_n(x)$ in Theorem 1.3 is defined to be

$$\theta_n(x) := \exists y [y = Mh_n^{\omega_n(I+1)} \wedge x \in y].$$

Lemma 2.6.3 shows Theorem 1.3.1.

$card(x)$ denotes the cardinality of sets x .

Lemma 2.6 *For each $n, m < \omega$, $ZF + (V = L)$ proves the followings.*

1. $y = \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(x) \rightarrow \text{card}(y) \leq \max\{\text{card}(x), \aleph_0\}$.
2. $\forall \alpha < \omega_m(I+1) A_n(\alpha)$.
3. $(\mathcal{K} \text{ is weakly compact}) \wedge \Theta \subset_{fin} (\mathcal{K}+1) \rightarrow \mathcal{K} \in Mh_n^{\omega_m(I+1)}[\Theta] \cap M(Mh_n^{\omega_m(I+1)}[\Theta])$.

Proof. 2.6.2. We show that $A_n(\alpha)$ is progressive, i.e., $\forall \alpha < \omega_m(I+1) [\forall \gamma < \alpha A_n(\gamma) \rightarrow A_n(\alpha)]$.

Assume $\forall \gamma < \alpha A_n(\gamma)$ and $\alpha < \omega_m(I+1)$. $\forall \beta < I \exists! x[x = \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(\beta)]$ follows from IH and the Replacement.

Next assume $\kappa \in R^+$ and $\kappa \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(\kappa)$. Then $\exists! \beta(\beta = \Psi_{\kappa,n}\alpha)$ follows from the regularity of κ and Proposition 2.5.

$\exists! x[x = Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta]]$ is easily seen from IH.

2.6.3. Suppose $\mathcal{K}$ is Π_1^1 -indescribable. We show

$$B_n(\alpha) :\Leftrightarrow \forall \Theta \subset_{fin} (\mathcal{K}+1) [\alpha \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}[\Theta](\mathcal{K}) \rightarrow \mathcal{K} \in Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta] \cap M(Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta])]$$

is progressive in α .

Suppose $\forall \xi < \alpha B_n(\xi)$, $\Theta \subset_{fin} (\mathcal{K}+1)$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}[\Theta](\mathcal{K})$. We have to show that $Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta]$ meets every club subset C_0 of $\mathcal{K}$. $\mathcal{K} \in Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta]$ follows from $\mathcal{K} \in M(Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta])$, cf. Proposition 2.9.2. We can assume that $\forall \pi \in C_0((\mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(\pi) \cap \mathcal{K} \subset \pi) \wedge \alpha \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}[\Theta](\pi))$ since all of $\{\pi < \mathcal{K} : \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}(\pi) \cap \mathcal{K} \subset \pi\}$ and $\{\pi < \mathcal{K} : \alpha \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}[\Theta](\pi)\}$ are club in $\mathcal{K}$.

By IH we have $\forall \xi \in \mathcal{H}_{\xi,n}[\Theta](\mathcal{K}) \cap \alpha [\mathcal{K} \in M(Mh_n^\xi[\Theta])]$. Since $\forall \pi \leq \mathcal{K} [\text{card}(\mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}](\pi)) \leq \pi]$, pick an injection $f : \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}[\Theta \cup \{\mathcal{K}\}](\mathcal{K}) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ so that $f''\mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}](\pi) \subset \pi$ for any weakly inaccessible $\pi \leq \mathcal{K}$.

Let $R_0 = \{f(\alpha)\}$, $R_1 = C_0$, $R_2 = \{f(\xi) : \xi \in \mathcal{H}_{\xi,n}[\Theta](\mathcal{K}) \cap \alpha\}$, $R_3 = \bigcup \{(Mh_n^\xi[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}] \cap \mathcal{K}) \times \{f(\pi)\} \times \{f(\xi)\} : \xi \in \mathcal{H}_{\xi,n}[\Theta](\mathcal{K}) \cap \alpha, \pi \leq \mathcal{K}\}$, and $R_4 = \{(f(\beta), f(\gamma)) : \{\beta, \gamma\} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}[\Theta \cup \{\mathcal{K}\}](\mathcal{K}), \beta < \gamma\}$.

Then $\langle V_{\mathcal{K}}, \in, R_i \rangle_{i \leq 4}$ enjoys a Π_1^1 -sentence saying that $\mathcal{K}$ is weakly inaccessible, $R_0 \neq \emptyset$, R_1 is a club subset of $\mathcal{K}$ and

$$\varphi :\Leftrightarrow \forall C : \text{club } \forall x, y [R_2(x) \wedge \theta(R_4, y) \rightarrow C \cap \{a : R_3(a, y, x)\} \neq \emptyset]$$

where $\theta(R_4, y)$ is a Σ_1^1 -formula such that for any $\pi \leq \mathcal{K}$

$$V_\pi \models \theta(R_4, y) \Leftrightarrow y = f(\pi)$$

Namely $\theta(R_4, y)$ says that there exists a function G on the class *Ord* of ordinals such that

$$\forall \beta, \gamma \in \text{Ord} [(\beta < \gamma \Leftrightarrow R_4(G(\beta), G(\gamma)) \wedge (G(\beta) < y)] \wedge \forall z (R_4(z, y) \rightarrow \exists \beta \in \text{Ord} (G(\beta) = z))$$

By the Π_1^1 -indescribability of $\mathcal{K}$, pick a $\pi < \mathcal{K}$ such that $\langle V_\pi, \in, R_i \cap V_\pi \rangle_{i \leq 4}$ enjoys the Π_1^1 -sentence.

We claim $\pi \in C_0 \cap Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta]$. π is weakly inaccessible, $f(\alpha) \in V_\pi$ and C_0 is club in π , and hence $\pi \in C_0$. It remains to see $\forall \xi \in \mathcal{H}_{\xi,n}[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}](\pi) \cap \alpha [\pi \in$

$M(Mh_n^\xi[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}])$. This follows from the fact that φ holds in $\langle V_\pi, \in, R_i \cap V_\pi \rangle_{i \leq 4}$, and $\forall \xi \in \mathcal{H}_{\xi,n}[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}](\pi) \cap \alpha(f(\xi) \in V_\pi)$ by $f''\mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}](\pi) \subset \pi$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\xi,n}[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}](\pi) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\xi,n}[\Theta](\mathcal{K})$.
Thus $\mathcal{K} \in M(Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta])$. $\square$

Definition 2.7 $\mathcal{H}(n)$ denotes a subset of $\mathcal{H}_{\omega_n(I+1),n}(\emptyset)$ such that every ordinal is hereditarily less than $\omega_n(I+1)$.

This means $\alpha \in \mathcal{H}(n) \Rightarrow \alpha < \omega_n(I+1)$, etc.

Corollary 2.8 For each $n < \omega$, $\mathcal{H}(n)$ is well-defined in $\text{ZF} + (V = L)$.

In the rest of this section some elementary facts are established.

- Proposition 2.9**
1. $\alpha \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}[\Theta](\pi) \ \& \ \pi \in Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta \cup \{\rho\}] \Rightarrow \pi \in Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta]$.
 2. $\pi \in M(Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}]) \Rightarrow \pi \in Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}]$.
 3. $\pi \in Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta] \ \& \ \xi \in \mathcal{H}_{\xi,n}[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}](\pi) \cap \alpha \Rightarrow \pi \in Mh_n^\xi[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}]$, and $\pi \in Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta] \ \& \ \xi \in \mathcal{H}_{\xi,n}[\Theta](\pi) \cap \alpha \Rightarrow \pi \in Mh_n^\xi[\Theta]$.

Proof. 2.9.2. This is seen from Proposition 2.9.1.

2.9.3. This is seen from Proposition 2.9.2. $\square$

In the following Proposition 2.10, we show that if $\mathcal{K} \in Mh_n^{\mathcal{K}^+}$ for $n \geq 1$, then $\mathcal{K}$ is a greatly Mahlo cardinal in the sense of Baumgartner-Taylor-Wagon [9].

M^α ($\alpha < \mathcal{K}^+$) denotes the set of α -weakly Mahlo cardinals defined as follows. $M^0 := \text{Reg} \cap \mathcal{K}$, $M^{\alpha+1} = M(M^\alpha)$, $M^\lambda = \bigcap \{M(M^\alpha) : \alpha < \lambda\}$ for limit ordinals λ with $\text{cf}(\lambda) < \mathcal{K}$, and $M^\lambda := \bigtriangleup \{M(M^{\lambda_i}) : i < \mathcal{K}\}$ for limit ordinals λ with $\text{cf}(\lambda) = \mathcal{K}$, where $\sup_{i < \mathcal{K}} \lambda_i = \lambda$ and the sequence $\{\lambda_i\}_{i < \mathcal{K}}$ is chosen so that it is the $<_L$ -minimal such sequence.

In the last case for $\pi < \mathcal{K}$, $\pi \in M^\lambda \Leftrightarrow \forall i < \pi(\pi \in M(M^{\lambda_i}))$.

Proposition 2.10 For $n \geq 1$ and $\sigma \leq \mathcal{K}$, the followings are provable in $\text{ZF} + (V = L)$.

1. $\sigma \in \Theta \wedge \pi \in Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta] \cap \sigma \wedge \alpha \in \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(\{\sigma, \sigma^+\} \cup \pi) \cap \sigma^+ \rightarrow \pi \in M^\alpha$.
2. $\sigma \in Mh_n^{\sigma^+}[\Theta] \rightarrow \forall \alpha < \sigma^+(\sigma \in M(M^\alpha))$.
3. The class of the greatly Mahlo cardinals below $\mathcal{K}$ is stationary in $\mathcal{K}$ if $\mathcal{K} \in Mh_n^{\mathcal{K}+1}$.

Proof. 2.10.1 by induction on $\alpha < \sigma^+$. Suppose $\sigma \in \Theta$, $\pi \in Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta] \cap \sigma$ and $\alpha \in \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(\{\sigma, \sigma^+\} \cup \pi) \cap \sigma^+$.

First consider the case when $\text{cf}(\alpha) = \sigma$, and let $\{\alpha_i\}_{i < \sigma}$ be the $<_L$ -minimal sequence such that $\sup_{i < \sigma} \alpha_i = \alpha$. Then $\{\alpha_i\}_{i < \sigma} \in \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(\{\alpha, \sigma\}) \subset \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(\{\sigma, \sigma^+\} \cup \pi)$. For $i < \pi$, $\alpha_i \in \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(\{\sigma, \sigma^+\} \cup \pi) \cap \alpha \subset \mathcal{H}_{\alpha_i,n}[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}](\pi) \cap \alpha$ by $\sigma \in \Theta$. $\pi \in Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta]$ yields $\pi \in M(Mh_n^{\alpha_i}[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}])$. Now for a club subset

C in π , pick a $\rho < \pi$ such that $\rho \in C \cap Mh_n^{\alpha_i}[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}]$. We can assume that $\alpha_i \in \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(\{\sigma, \sigma^+\} \cup \rho)$ by $\alpha_i \in \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(\{\sigma, \sigma^+\} \cup \pi)$. Thus IH yields $\rho \in M^{\alpha_i}$, and hence $\pi \in M(M^{\alpha_i})$ for any $i < \pi$.

Second consider the case when $cf(\alpha) < \sigma$. Then $cf(\alpha) \in \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(\{\alpha\}) \cap \sigma \subset \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(\{\sigma, \sigma^+\} \cup \pi) \cap \sigma \subset \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}[\{\sigma\}](\pi) \cap \sigma \subset \pi$ by $\pi \in Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta]$ and $\sigma \in \Theta$. Thus $cf(\alpha) < \pi$. Pick a cofinal sequence $\{\alpha_i\}_{i < cf(\alpha)} \in \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(\{\sigma, \sigma^+\} \cup \pi)$. Then for any $i < cf(\alpha) < \pi$ we have $\alpha_i \in \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(\{\sigma, \sigma^+\} \cup \pi) \cap \alpha$, and hence $\pi \in M(Mh_n^{\alpha_i}[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}])$. As in the first case we see that $\pi \in M(M^{\alpha_i})$ for any $i < cf(\alpha)$.

Finally let $\alpha = \beta + 1$. Then $\beta \in \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(\{\sigma, \sigma^+\} \cup \pi)$ together with IH yields $\pi \in M(M^\beta)$.

2.10.2. Suppose $\sigma \in Mh_n^{\sigma^+}[\Theta]$ and $\exists \alpha < \sigma^+ (\sigma \notin M(M^\alpha))$. Let $\alpha < \sigma^+$ be the minimal ordinal such that $\sigma \notin M(M^\alpha)$, and C be a club subset of σ such that $C \cap M^\alpha = \emptyset$. Then $\alpha \in \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(\{\sigma, \sigma^+\}) \cap \sigma^+ \subset \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,n}[\Theta \cup \{\sigma\}](\sigma) \cap \sigma^+$. By $\sigma \in Mh_n^{\sigma^+}[\Theta]$ we have $\sigma \in M(Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta \cup \{\sigma\}])$. Pick a $\pi \in C \cap Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta \cup \{\sigma\}] \cap \sigma$. Proposition 2.10.1 yields $\pi \in M^\alpha$. A contradiction.

2.10.3. If $\mathcal{K} \in Mh_n^{\mathcal{K}+1}$, then $\mathcal{K} \in M(Mh_n^\mathcal{K})$. Let $\sigma \in Mh_n^\mathcal{K} \cap \mathcal{K}$. Then $\sigma^+ \in \mathcal{H}_{\sigma^+,n}[\{\sigma\}](\sigma) \cap \mathcal{K}$, and hence $\sigma \in M(Mh_n^{\sigma^+}[\{\sigma\}])$. Proposition 2.9.2 yields $\sigma \in Mh_n^{\sigma^+}[\{\sigma\}]$. From Proposition 2.10.2 we see that σ is greatly Mahlo. $\square$

3 A theory for weakly compact cardinals

In this section the set theory $\text{ZF} + (V = L) + (\mathcal{K} \text{ is weakly compact})$ is paraphrased to another set theory $\text{T}(\mathcal{K}, I)$ as in [7].

Let $\mathcal{K}$ be the least weakly compact cardinal, and $I > \mathcal{K}$ the least weakly inaccessible cardinal above $\mathcal{K}$. κ, λ, ρ ranges over uncountable regular ordinals such that $\mathcal{K} < \kappa, \lambda, \rho < I$.

In the following Definition 3.2, the predicate P is intended to denote the relation

$$P(\lambda, x, y) \Leftrightarrow x = F_{x \cup \{\lambda\}}^{\Sigma_1}(\lambda) \ \& \ y = F_{x \cup \{\lambda\}}^{\Sigma_1}(I) := \text{rng}(F_{x \cup \{\lambda\}}^{\Sigma_1}) \cap \text{Ord}$$

and the predicate $P_{I,n}(x)$ is intended to denote the relation

$$P_{I,n}(x) \Leftrightarrow x = F_x^{\Sigma_n}(I).$$

Definition 3.1 1. Let $\vec{X} = X_0, \dots, X_{n-1}$ be a list of unary predicates. A *stratified formula with respect to the variables* $\vec{x} = x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}$ is a formula $\varphi[\vec{x}]$ in the language $\{\in\}$ obtained from a (first-order) formula $\varphi[\vec{X}]$ in the language $\{\in\} \cup \vec{X}$ by replacing any atomic formula $X_i(z)$ by $z \in x_i$ for $i < n$.

2. For a formula φ and a set x , φ^x denotes the result of restricting every unbounded quantifier $\exists z, \forall z$ in φ to $\exists z \in x, \forall z \in x$.

3. $\alpha \in \text{Ord} :\Leftrightarrow \forall x \in a \forall y \in x (y \in a) \wedge \forall x, y \in a (x \in y \vee x = y \vee y \in x)$, and by $\alpha < \beta$ we tacitly assume that α, β are ordinals, i.e., $\alpha < \beta :\Leftrightarrow \{\alpha, \beta\} \subset \text{Ord} \wedge \alpha \in \beta$.

Definition 3.2 $T(\mathcal{K}, I, n)$ denotes the set theory defined as follows.

1. Its language is $\{\in, P, P_{I,n}, \text{Reg}, \mathcal{K}\}$ for a ternary predicate P , unary predicates $P_{I,n}$ and Reg , and an individual constant $\mathcal{K}$.
2. Its axioms are obtained from those of Kripke-Platek set theory with the axiom of infinity $\text{KP}\omega$ in the expanded language, the axiom of constructibility, $V = L$ together with the axiom schemata saying that
 - (a) the ordinals κ with $\text{Reg}(\kappa)$ is an uncountable regular ordinal $> \mathcal{K}$ ($\text{Reg}(\kappa) \rightarrow \mathcal{K} < \kappa \in \text{Ord}$) and ($\text{Reg}(\kappa) \rightarrow a \in \text{Ord} \cap \kappa \rightarrow \exists x, y \in \text{Ord} \cap \kappa [a < x \wedge P(\kappa, x, y)]$), and the ordinal x with $P(\kappa, x, y)$ is a critical point of the Σ_1 elementary embedding from an $L_y \cong \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(x \cup \{\kappa\})$ to the universe L_I ($P(\kappa, x, y) \rightarrow \{x, y\} \subset \text{Ord} \wedge x < y < \kappa \wedge \text{Reg}(\kappa)$ and $P(\kappa, x, y) \rightarrow a \in \text{Ord} \cap x \rightarrow \varphi[\kappa, a] \rightarrow \varphi^y[x, a]$ for any Σ_1 -formula φ in the language $\{\in\}$),
 - (b) there are cofinally many regular ordinals ($\forall x \in \text{Ord} \exists y [x \geq \mathcal{K} \rightarrow y > x \wedge \text{Reg}(y)]$),
 - (c) the ordinal x with $P_{I,n}(x)$ is a critical point of the Σ_n elementary embedding from $L_x \cong \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_n}^I(x)$ to the universe L_I ($P_{I,n}(x) \rightarrow x \in \text{Ord}$ and $P_{I,n}(x) \rightarrow a \in \text{Ord} \cap x \rightarrow \varphi[a] \rightarrow \varphi^x[a]$ for any Σ_n -formula φ in the language $\{\in\}$), and there are cofinally many such ordinals x ($\mathcal{K} < a \in \text{Ord} \rightarrow \exists x \in \text{Ord} [a < x \wedge P_{I,n}(x)]$),
 - (d) the axiom ‘ $\mathcal{K}$ is uncountable regular’

$$\begin{aligned} \text{‘}\mathcal{K} \text{ is uncountable regular’} & :\Leftrightarrow (\mathcal{K} > \omega) \\ & \wedge \quad \forall \alpha < \mathcal{K} \forall f \in {}^\alpha \mathcal{K} \exists \beta < \mathcal{K} (f'' \alpha \subset \beta) \end{aligned}$$

and the axiom saying that $\forall B \subset \mathcal{K} [\mathcal{K} \in M(B) \rightarrow \exists \rho < \mathcal{K} (\alpha \in M(B) \wedge \text{Reg}(\rho))]$, which is codified by the following (3).

$$\forall B \in L_{\mathcal{K}^+} [B \subset \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \neg \tau(B, \mathcal{K}) \rightarrow \exists \rho < \mathcal{K} (\neg \tau(B, \rho) \wedge \text{Reg}(\rho))] \quad (3)$$

where

$$\tau(B, \rho) :\Leftrightarrow \exists C \subset \rho ((C \text{ is club})^\rho \wedge B \cap C = \emptyset) \quad (4)$$

where $(C \text{ is club})^\rho$ is a formula saying that C is a club subset of ρ . Namely $\tau(B, \rho)$ says that the set B is thin, i.e., non-stationary in ρ . Note that $(C \text{ is club})^\rho \wedge B \cap C = \emptyset$ is stratified with respect to B, C , and $\tau(B, \rho)$ is stratified with respect to B .

The following Lemma 3.3 is seen as in [7].

Lemma 3.3 $T(\mathcal{K}, I) := \bigcup_{n \in \omega} T(\mathcal{K}, I, n)$ is equivalent to the set theory $\text{ZF} + (V = L) + \mathbb{K}$.

4 Operator controlled derivations for weakly compact cardinals

In this section, operator controlled derivations are first introduced, and inferences (**Ref**_K) for Π_1^1 -indescribability are then eliminated from operator controlled derivations of Σ_2^1 -sentences φ^{V_K} over K .

In this section n denotes a fixed positive integer, and we will work under the assumption $K \in Mh_n^{\omega_n(I+1)}$ over $ZF + (V = L)$. We tacitly assume that any ordinal is in $\mathcal{H}(n)$.

4.1 Classes of sentences

$K \in L = L_I = \bigcup_{\alpha \in Ord} L_\alpha$ denotes a transitive and wellfounded model of $ZF + (V = L)$, where $L_{\alpha+1}$ is the set of L_α -definable subsets of L_α . Ord denotes the class of all ordinals in L , and I the least ordinal not in L , while Ord^ε denotes the codes of ordinals less than $\omega_n(I+1)$.

Definition 4.1 For $a \in L$, $rk_L(a)$ denotes the L -rank of a .

$$rk_L(a) := \min\{\alpha \in Ord : a \in L_{\alpha+1}\}.$$

If $a \in b \in L$, then $a \in b \subset L_\beta$ for $\beta = rk_L(b)$ and $a \in L_\beta$. Hence $rk_L(a) < \beta = rk_L(b)$.

The language $\mathcal{L}_c$ is obtained from $\{\in, P, P_{I,n}, Reg, K\}$ by adding names (individual constants) c_a of each set $a \in L$. c_a is identified with a .

Then *formulae* in $\mathcal{L}_c$ is defined as usual. Unbounded quantifiers $\exists x, \forall x$ are denoted by $\exists x \in L_I, \forall x \in L_I$, resp.

For formulae A in $\mathcal{L}_c$, $qk(A)$ denotes the finite set of L -ranks $rk_L(a)$ of sets a which are bounds of ‘bounded’ quantifiers $\exists x \in a, \forall x \in a$ occurring in A . Moreover $k(A)$ denotes the set of L -ranks of sets occurring in A , while $k^E(A)$ denotes the set of L -ranks of sets occurring in an unstratified position in A . Both $k(A)$ and $k^E(A)$ are defined to include L -ranks of bounds of ‘bounded’ quantifiers. Thus $qk(A) \subset k^E(A) \subset k(A) \leq I$. By definition we set $0 \in qk(A)$.

In the following definition, Var denotes the set of variables and set $rk_L(x) := 0$ for variables $x \in Var$.

Definition 4.2 1. $k(\neg A) = k(A)$ and similarly for k^E, qk .

2. $qk(M) = \{0\}$ for any literal M .

3. $k^E(M) = k(M) = \{rk_L(t) : t \in \vec{t}\} \cup \{0\}$ for literals $Q(\vec{t})$ with predicates $Q \in \{P, P_{I,n}, Reg\}$.

4. $k(t \in s) = \{rk_L(t), rk_L(s), 0\}$ and $k^E(t \in s) = \{rk_L(t), 0\}$.

5. $k(A_0 \vee A_1) = k(A_0) \cup k(A_1)$ and similarly for k^E, qk .

6. For $t \in L_I \cup \{L_I\} \cup Var$, $k(\exists x \in t A(x)) = \{rk_L(t)\} \cup k(A(x))$ and similarly for k^E, qk .

For example $k^E(a \in b) = \{\text{rk}_L(a), 0\}$, and $\mathbf{qk}(\exists x \in a A(x)) = \{\text{rk}_L(a)\} \cup \mathbf{qk}(A(x))$.

Definition 4.3 1. $A \in \Delta_0$ iff there exists a Δ_0 -formula $\theta[\vec{x}]$ in the language $\{\in\}$ and terms $\vec{t}$ such that $A \equiv \theta[\vec{t}]$. This means that A is bounded, and the predicates $P, P_{I,n}, \text{Reg}$ do not occur in A .

2. Putting $\Sigma_0 := \Pi_0 := \Delta_0$, the classes Σ_m and Π_m of formulae in the language $\{\in\}$ with terms are defined as usual using quantifiers $\exists x \in L_I, \forall x \in L_I$, where by definition $\Sigma_m \cup \Pi_m \subset \Sigma_{m+1} \cap \Pi_{m+1}$.

Each formula in $\Sigma_m \cup \Pi_m$ is in prenex normal form with alternating unbounded quantifiers and Δ_0 -matrix.

3. $A \in \Delta_0(\lambda)$ iff there exists a Δ_0 -formula $\theta[\vec{x}]$ in the language $\{\in\}$ and terms $\vec{t}$ such that $A \equiv \theta[\vec{t}]$ and $k(A) < \lambda$.

4. $A \in \Sigma_1(\lambda)$ iff either $A \in \Delta_0(\lambda)$ or $A \equiv \exists x \in L_\lambda B$ with $B \in \Delta_0(\lambda)$.

Note that $\Sigma(\lambda) \subset \Delta_0$ for any $\lambda < I$.

5. The class of sentences $\Sigma_m(\lambda), \Pi_m(\lambda)$ ($m < \omega$) are defined as usual.

6. $\Sigma_0^1(\lambda)$ denotes the set of first-order formulae on L_λ , i.e., $\Sigma_0^1(\lambda) := \bigcup_{m \in \omega} \Sigma_m(\lambda)$.

Note that the predicates $P, P_{I,n}, \text{Reg}$ do not occur in Σ_m -formulae nor in $\Sigma_0^1(\lambda)$ -formulae.

Definition 4.4 A set $\Sigma^{\Sigma_{n+1}}(\lambda)$ of sentences is defined recursively as follows.

1. $\Sigma_{n+1} \subset \Sigma^{\Sigma_{n+1}}(\lambda)$.
2. Each literal including $\text{Reg}(a), P(a, b, c), P_{I,n}(a)$ and their negations is in $\Sigma^{\Sigma_{n+1}}(\lambda)$.
3. $\Sigma^{\Sigma_{n+1}}(\lambda)$ is closed under propositional connectives $\vee, \wedge$.
4. Suppose $\forall x \in b A(x) \notin \Delta_0$. Then $\forall x \in b A(x) \in \Sigma^{\Sigma_{n+1}}(\lambda)$ iff $A(\emptyset) \in \Sigma^{\Sigma_{n+1}}(\lambda)$ and $\text{rk}_L(b) < \lambda$.
5. Suppose $\exists x \in b A(x) \notin \Delta_0$. Then $\exists x \in b A(x) \in \Sigma^{\Sigma_{n+1}}(\lambda)$ iff $A(\emptyset) \in \Sigma^{\Sigma_{n+1}}(\lambda)$ and $\text{rk}_L(b) \leq \lambda$.

Definition 4.5 Let us extend the domain $\text{dom}(F_{x \cup \{\kappa\}}^{\Sigma_1}) = \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(x \cup \{\kappa\})$ of Mostowski collapse to formulae.

$$\text{dom}(F_{x \cup \{\kappa\}}^{\Sigma_1}) = \{A \in \Sigma_1 \cup \Pi_1 : k(A) \subset \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(x \cup \{\kappa\})\}.$$

For $A \in \text{dom}(F_{x \cup \{\kappa\}}^{\Sigma_1})$ $F_{x \cup \{\kappa\}}^{\Sigma_1} A$ denotes the result of replacing each constant γ by $F_{x \cup \{\kappa\}}^{\Sigma_1}(\gamma)$, each unbounded existential quantifier $\exists z \in L_I$ by $\exists z \in L_{F_{x \cup \{\kappa\}}^{\Sigma_1}(I)}$, and each unbounded universal quantifier $\forall z \in L_I$ by $\forall z \in L_{F_{x \cup \{\kappa\}}^{\Sigma_1}(I)}$.

For sequent, i.e., finite set of sentences $\Gamma \subset \text{dom}(F_{x \cup \{\kappa\}}^{\Sigma_1})$, put $F_{x \cup \{\kappa\}}^{\Sigma_1} \text{''} \Gamma = \{F_{x \cup \{\kappa\}}^{\Sigma_1} \text{''} A : A \in \Gamma\}$.

Likewise the domain $\text{dom}(F_x^{\Sigma_n}) = \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_n}^I(x)$ is extended to

$$\text{dom}(F_x^{\Sigma_n}) = \{A \in \Sigma_n \cup \Pi_n : \mathbf{k}(A) \subset \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_n}^I(x)\}$$

and for formula $A \in \text{dom}(F_x^{\Sigma_n})$, $F_x^{\Sigma_n} \text{''} A$, and sequent $\Gamma \subset \text{dom}(F_x^{\Sigma_n})$, $F_x^{\Sigma_n} \text{''} \Gamma$ are defined similarly.

Proposition 4.6 For $F = F_{x \cup \{\kappa\}}^{\Sigma_1}, F_x^{\Sigma_n}$ and $A \in \text{dom}(F)$

$$L_I \models A \leftrightarrow F \text{''} A.$$

The assignment of disjunctions and conjunctions to sentences is defined as in [7].

Definition 4.7 1. If M is one of the literals $a \in b, a \notin b$, then for $J := 0$

$$M := \begin{cases} \bigvee (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J} & \text{if } M \text{ is false (in } L_I) \\ \bigwedge (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J} & \text{if } M \text{ is true} \end{cases}$$

2. $(A_0 \vee A_1) := \bigvee (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$ and $(A_0 \wedge A_1) := \bigwedge (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$ for $J := 2$.

3.

$$\text{Reg}(a) := \bigvee (a = a)_{\iota \in J} \text{ and } \neg \text{Reg}(a) := \bigwedge (a \neq a)_{\iota \in 1}$$

with

$$J := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a \in R \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

4.

$$P(a, b, c) := \bigvee (a = a)_{\iota \in J} \text{ and } \neg P(a, b, c) := \bigwedge (a \neq a)_{\iota \in J}$$

with

$$J := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a \in R \text{ \& } \exists \alpha \in \text{Ord}_\varepsilon [b = \Psi_{a,n} \alpha \text{ \& } \alpha \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha(b) \text{ \& } c = F_{b \cup \{a\}}^{\Sigma_1}(I)] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

5.

$$P_{I,n}(a) := \bigvee (a = a)_{\iota \in J} \text{ and } \neg P_{I,n}(a) := \bigwedge (a \neq a)_{\iota \in J}$$

with

$$J := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \exists \alpha \in \text{Ord}_\varepsilon [a = \Psi_{I,n} \alpha \text{ \& } \alpha \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha(a)] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

6. Let $\exists z \in b \theta[z] \in \Sigma_n$ for $b \in L_I \cup \{L_I\}$, and assume that there exists an ordinal α in the set $k(\exists z \in b \theta[z])$ such that $\alpha > \mathcal{K}^+$. Then for the set

$$\mu z \in b \theta[z] := \min_{<_L} \{d : (d \in b \wedge \theta[d]) \vee (\neg \exists z \in b \theta[z] \wedge d = 0)\} \quad (5)$$

with a canonical well ordering $<_L$ on L , and $J = \{d\}$

$$\begin{aligned} \exists z \in b \theta[z] &:= \bigvee (d \in b \wedge \theta[d])_{d \in J} \\ \forall z \in b \neg \theta[z] &:= \bigwedge (d \in b \rightarrow \neg \theta[d])_{d \in J} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $d \in b$ denotes a true literal, e.g., $d \notin d$ when $b = L_I$.

This case is applied only when $\exists z \in b \theta[z]$ is a formula in $\{\in\} \cup L_I$, and is either an unbounded Σ_n -formula or a bounded formula having a constant whose L -rank is larger than $\mathcal{K}^+$.

7. Otherwise set for $a \in L_I \cup \{L_I\}$

$$\exists x \in a A(x) := \bigvee (A(b))_{b \in J} \text{ and } \forall x \in a A(x) := \bigwedge (A(b))_{b \in J}$$

for

$$J := \{b : b \in a\}.$$

This case is applied if one of the predicates $P, P_{I,n}, Reg$ occurs in $\exists x \in a A(x)$, or $\exists x \in a A(x) \notin \Sigma_n$, or $\exists x \in a A(x) \in \Sigma_0^1(\mathcal{K}^+)$.

In particular we have

$$\begin{aligned} \neg \tau(B, \mathcal{K}) &:= \bigwedge \{C \not\subset \mathcal{K} \vee \neg(C \text{ is club})^\mathcal{K} \vee B \cap C \neq \emptyset : C \in L_{\mathcal{K}^+}\} \\ \tau(B, \mathcal{K}) &:= \bigvee \{C \subset \mathcal{K} \wedge (C \text{ is club})^\mathcal{K} \wedge B \cap C = \emptyset : C \in L_{\mathcal{K}^+}\} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tau(B, \rho) := \Leftrightarrow \exists C \subset \rho((C \text{ is club})^\rho \wedge B \cap C = \emptyset) \quad (4)$$

The definition of the rank $\text{rk}(A)$ of sentences A in [7] is slightly changed as follows. The rank $\text{rk}(A)$ of sentences A is defined by recursion on the number of symbols occurring in A .

Definition 4.8 1. $\text{rk}(\neg A) := \text{rk}(A)$.

2. $\text{rk}(a \in b) := \text{rk}(a \notin b) := 0$.

3. $\text{rk}(Reg(\alpha)) := \text{rk}(P(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)) := \text{rk}(P_{I,n}(\alpha)) := 1$.

4. $\text{rk}(A_0 \vee A_1) := \max\{\text{rk}(A_0), \text{rk}(A_1)\} + 1$.

5. $\text{rk}(\exists x \in a A(x)) := \max\{\omega\alpha, \text{rk}(A(\emptyset)) + 2\}$ for $\alpha = \text{rk}_L(a)$.

Proposition 4.9 *Let $A \simeq \bigvee (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$ or $A \simeq \bigwedge (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$.*

1. $A \in \Sigma^{\Sigma_{n+1}}(\lambda) \Rightarrow \forall \iota \in J (A_\iota \in \Sigma^{\Sigma_{n+1}}(\lambda))$.
2. *For an ordinal $\lambda \leq I$ with $\omega\lambda = \lambda$, $\text{rk}(A) < \lambda \Rightarrow A \in \Sigma^{\Sigma_{n+1}}(\lambda)$.*
3. $\text{rk}(A) < I + \omega$.
4. $\text{rk}(A)$ *is in the Skolem hull of $\omega\mathbf{qk}(A) \cup \{0, 1\}$ under the addition with $\omega\mathbf{qk}(A) = \{\omega\alpha : \alpha \in \mathbf{qk}(A)\}$.*
5. $\forall \iota \in J (\text{rk}(A_\iota) < \text{rk}(A))$.

Proof. 4.9.5. This is seen from the fact that $a \in b \in L \Rightarrow \text{rk}_L(a) < \text{rk}_L(b)$. $\square$

4.2 Operator controlled derivations

$\kappa, \lambda, \sigma, \pi$ ranges over R^+ .

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be an operator, Θ a finite set of ordinals, $\kappa \in R^+$, Γ a sequent, $a \in \text{Ord}^\varepsilon$ and $b < I + \omega$. We define a relation $(\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^a \Gamma$, which is read ‘there exists an infinitary derivation of Γ which is (κ, n) -controlled by $\mathcal{H}$ and Θ , and whose height is at most a and its cut rank is less than b ’.

Recall that R denotes the set of uncountable cardinals ρ such that $\mathcal{K} < \rho < I$, and $\lambda > \mathcal{K}$ in the inference rules $(\mathbf{P}_\lambda)$ and $(\mathbf{F}_{x \cup \{\lambda\}}^{\Sigma_1})$.

Sequents are finite sets of sentences, and inference rules are formulated in one-sided sequent calculus.

Definition 4.10

$$\mathbf{k}_{\mathcal{K}}^E(A) := \begin{cases} \mathbf{k}^E(A) & \text{if } A \in \Sigma_0^1(\mathcal{K}^+) \\ \mathbf{k}(A) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Definition 4.11 $(\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^a \Gamma$ holds if

$$\mathbf{k}_{\mathcal{K}}^E(\Gamma) := \bigcup \{\mathbf{k}_{\mathcal{K}}^E(A) : A \in \Gamma\} \subset \mathcal{H} := \mathcal{H}(\emptyset) \& a \in \mathcal{H}[\Theta] \quad (7)$$

and one of the following cases holds:

$$(\bigvee) \ A \simeq \bigvee \{A_\iota : \iota \in J\}, \ A \in \Gamma \text{ and for an } \iota \in J, \ a(\iota) < a \text{ and } \text{rk}_L(\iota) < \kappa \Rightarrow \text{rk}_L(\iota) < a$$

$$\frac{(\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^{a(\iota)} \Gamma, A_\iota}{(\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^a \Gamma} (\bigvee)$$

$$(\bigwedge) \ A \simeq \bigwedge \{A_\iota : \iota \in J\}, \ A \in \Gamma \text{ and } a(\iota) < a \text{ for any } \iota \in J$$

$$\frac{\{(\mathcal{H}[\{\text{rk}_L(\iota)\}], \Theta, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^{a(\iota)} \Gamma, A_\iota : \iota \in J\}}{(\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^a \Gamma} (\bigwedge)$$

(cut) $\text{rk}(C) < b$ and an $a_0 < a$

$$\frac{(\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg C \quad (\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^{a_0} C, \Gamma}{(\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^a \Gamma} \text{ (cut)}$$

($\mathbf{P}_\lambda$) $\alpha < \lambda \in R$ and $\{\exists x < \lambda \exists y < \lambda [\alpha < x \wedge P(\lambda, x, y)]\} \cup \Gamma_0 = \Gamma$

$$\frac{}{\exists x < \lambda \exists y < \lambda [\alpha < x \wedge P(\lambda, x, y)], \Gamma_0} (\mathbf{P}_\lambda)$$

($\mathbf{F}_{x \cup \{\lambda\}}^{\Sigma_1}$) Let $\lambda \in R$ and $x \in \mathcal{H}[\Theta]$ where for some b

$$x = \Psi_{\lambda, n} b.$$

If $\Gamma = \Lambda \cup (F_{x \cup \{\lambda\}}^{\Sigma_1} \text{''} \Gamma_0)$, $\Gamma_0 \subset \Sigma_1$, $a_0 < a$ and

$$\mathbf{k}(\Gamma_0) \subset \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I((\mathcal{H} \cap x) \cup \{\lambda\})$$

then

$$\frac{(\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^{a_0} \Lambda, \Gamma_0}{(\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^a \Lambda, F_{x \cup \{\lambda\}}^{\Sigma_1} \text{''} \Gamma_0} (\mathbf{F}_{x \cup \{\lambda\}}^{\Sigma_1})$$

where $F_{x \cup \{\lambda\}}^{\Sigma_1}$ denotes the Mostowski collapse $F_{x \cup \{\lambda\}}^{\Sigma_1} : \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(x \cup \{\lambda\}) \leftrightarrow L_{F_{x \cup \{\lambda\}}^{\Sigma_1}(I)}$.

($\mathbf{P}_{I, n}$) $\alpha < I$ and $\{\exists x < I [\alpha < x \wedge P_{I, n}(x)]\} \cup \Gamma_0 = \Gamma$

$$\frac{}{\exists x < I [\alpha < x \wedge P_{I, n}(x)], \Gamma_0} (\mathbf{P}_{I, n})$$

($\mathbf{F}_x^{\Sigma_n}$) Let

$$x = \Psi_{I, n} b \in \mathcal{H}[\Theta].$$

If $\Gamma = \Lambda \cup (F_x^{\Sigma_n} \text{''} \Gamma_0)$, $\Gamma_0 \subset \Sigma_n$, $a_0 < a$ and

$$\mathbf{k}(\Gamma_0) \subset \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_n}^I(\mathcal{H} \cap x)$$

then

$$\frac{(\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^{a_0} \Lambda, \Gamma_0}{(\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^a \Lambda, F_x^{\Sigma_n} \text{''} \Gamma_0} (\mathbf{F}_x^{\Sigma_n})$$

where $F_x^{\Sigma_n}$ denotes the Mostowski collapse $F_x^{\Sigma_n} : \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_n}^I(x) \leftrightarrow L_{F_x^{\Sigma_n}(I)}$.

($\mathbf{Ref}_\mathcal{K}$) If $\max\{a_\ell, a_r\} < a$, and $B \subset \mathcal{K}$, $B \in \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(\{\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}^+\})$, then

$$\frac{(\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^{a_\ell} \Gamma, \neg \tau(B, \mathcal{K}) \quad (\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^{a_r} \Gamma, \forall \rho < \mathcal{K} \tau(B, \rho)}{(\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^a \Gamma} (\mathbf{Ref}_\mathcal{K})$$

where

$$\tau(B, \rho) := \exists C \subset \rho (C \text{ is club})^\rho \wedge B \cap C = \emptyset \quad (4)$$

which is stratified with respect to B .

Proposition 4.12 $(\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^a \Gamma \& \lambda \leq \kappa \Rightarrow (\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \lambda, n) \vdash_b^a \Gamma$.

We will state some lemmata for the operator controlled derivations with sketches of their proofs since these can be shown as in [10] and [7].

In what follows by an operator we mean an $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$ for a finite set Θ of ordinals.

$$(\mathcal{H}, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^a \Gamma :\Leftrightarrow (\mathcal{H}, \emptyset, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^a \Gamma$$

Lemma 4.13 (Tautology)

$$(\mathcal{H}[\mathbf{k}_{\mathcal{K}}^E(A)], I, n) \vdash_0^{I+2\text{rk}(A)} \Gamma, \neg A, A.$$

Lemma 4.14 ($\Delta_0(I)$ -completeness) *If $\Gamma \subset \Delta_0(I)$ and $\bigvee \Gamma$ is true, then*

$$(\mathcal{H}[\mathbf{k}_{\mathcal{K}}^E(\Gamma)], I, n) \vdash_0^{I+2\text{rk}(\Gamma)} \Gamma$$

where $\text{rk}(\Gamma) = \text{rk}(A_0) \# \dots \# \text{rk}(A_n)$ for $\Gamma = \{A_0, \dots, A_n\}$.

Lemma 4.15 (Elimination of false sentences)

Let A be a false sentence, i.e., $L_I \not\models A$, such that $\mathbf{k}(A) \subset \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I((\mathcal{K} + 1) \cup \{\mathcal{K}^+\}) \cap \mathcal{K}^+$. Then

$$(\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^a \Gamma, A \Rightarrow (\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^a \Gamma.$$

Proof. Consider the case when A is a main formula of an $(\mathbf{F}_{x \cup \{\mathcal{K}^+\}}^{\Sigma_1})$ with $x > \mathcal{K}$. We have $F_{x \cup \{\mathcal{K}^+\}}^{\Sigma_1}(a) = a$ for any a with $\text{rk}_L(a) < x$.

We claim $F_{x \cup \{\mathcal{K}^+\}}^{\Sigma_1} A \equiv A$. Let $b \in \mathbf{k}(A)$. Then $\text{rk}_L(b) \in \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I((\mathcal{K} + 1) \cup \{\mathcal{K}^+\}) \cap \mathcal{K}^+ \subset \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(x \cup \{\mathcal{K}^+\}) \cap \mathcal{K}^+ \subset x$. Hence $F_{x \cup \{\mathcal{K}^+\}}^{\Sigma_1}(b) = b$. $\square$

Lemma 4.16 (Embedding)

For each axiom A in $\mathbf{T}(\mathcal{K}, I, n)$, there is an $m < \omega$ such that for any operator $\mathcal{H}$

$$(\mathcal{H}[\{\mathcal{K}\}], I, n) \vdash_I^{I \cdot m} \text{'}\mathcal{K} \text{ is uncountable regular'} \rightarrow A.$$

Proof.

The axiom for Π_1^1 -indescribability

$$\forall B \in L_{\mathcal{K}^+} [B \subset \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \neg \tau(B, \mathcal{K}) \rightarrow \exists \rho < \mathcal{K} (\neg \tau(B, \rho) \wedge \text{Reg}(\rho))] \quad (3)$$

follows from the inference rule $(\mathbf{Ref}_{\mathcal{K}})$ and (3) $\simeq \bigwedge (B \subset \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \neg \tau(B, \mathcal{K}) \rightarrow \exists \rho < \mathcal{K} (\neg \tau(B, \rho) \wedge \text{Reg}(\rho)))_{B \in L_{\mathcal{K}^+}}$ for $B := \mu B \in L_{\mathcal{K}^+} (B \subset \mathcal{K} \wedge \neg \tau(B, \mathcal{K}) \wedge \forall \rho < \mathcal{K} (\text{Reg}(\rho) \rightarrow \tau(B, \rho))) \in \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(\{\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}^+\})$. $\square$

Lemma 4.17 (Inversion)

Let $d = \mu z \in b A[\vec{c}, z]$ for $(\exists z \in b A) \in \Sigma_n \setminus \Sigma_0^1(\mathcal{K}^+)$.

$$(\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^a \Gamma, \exists z \in b A[\vec{c}, z] \Rightarrow (\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^a \Gamma, d \in b \wedge A[\vec{c}, d]$$

and

$$(\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^a \Gamma, \forall z \in b \neg A[\vec{c}, z] \Rightarrow (\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^a \Gamma, d \in b \rightarrow \neg A[\vec{c}, d]$$

Lemma 4.18 (Reduction)

Let $C \simeq \bigvee (C_i)_{i \in J}$.

1. Suppose $C \notin \{\exists x < \lambda \exists y < \lambda [\alpha < x \wedge P(\lambda, x, y)] : \alpha < \lambda \in R\} \cup \{\exists x < I [\alpha < x \wedge P_{I,n}(x)] : \alpha < I\}$.

Then

$$(\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \kappa, n) \vdash_c^a \Delta, \neg C \ \& \ (\mathcal{H}, \kappa, n) \vdash_c^b C, \Gamma \ \& \ \mathcal{K} \leq \text{rk}(C) \leq c \Rightarrow (\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \kappa, n) \vdash_c^{a+b} \Delta, \Gamma$$

2. Assume $C \equiv (\exists x < \lambda \exists y < \lambda [\alpha < x \wedge P(\lambda, x, y)])$ for an $\alpha < \lambda \in R$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{H}_\beta$.

Then

$$(\mathcal{H}_\beta, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^a \Gamma, \neg C \Rightarrow (\mathcal{H}_{\beta+1}, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^a \Gamma$$

3. Assume $C \equiv (\exists x < I [\alpha < x \wedge P_{I,n}(x)])$ for an $\alpha < I$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{H}_\beta$.

Then

$$(\mathcal{H}_\beta, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^a \Gamma, \neg C \Rightarrow (\mathcal{H}_{\beta+1}, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^a \Gamma$$

Lemma 4.19 (Predicative Cut-elimination)

1. $(\mathcal{H}, \kappa, n) \vdash_{c+\omega^a}^b \Gamma \ \& \ [c, c + \omega^a[\cap(\{\lambda + 1 : \lambda \in R\} \cup \{I\})] = \emptyset \ \& \ a \in \mathcal{H} \Rightarrow (\mathcal{H}, \kappa, n) \vdash_c^{\varphi ab} \Gamma$.
2. For $\lambda \in R$, $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \kappa, n) \vdash_{\lambda+2}^b \Gamma \ \& \ \gamma \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma \ \& \Rightarrow (\mathcal{H}_{\gamma+b}, \kappa, n) \vdash_{\lambda+1}^{\omega^b} \Gamma$.
3. $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \kappa, n) \vdash_{I+1}^b \Gamma \ \& \ \gamma \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma \ \& \Rightarrow (\mathcal{H}_{\gamma+b}, \kappa, n) \vdash_I^{\omega^b} \Gamma$.
4. $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \kappa, n) \vdash_{c+\omega^a}^b \Gamma \ \& \ \max\{a, b, c\} < I \ \& \ a \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma \Rightarrow (\mathcal{H}_{\gamma+\varphi ab}, \kappa, n) \vdash_c^{\varphi ab} \Gamma$.

Definition 4.20 For a formula $\exists x \in d A$ and ordinals $\lambda = \text{rk}_L(d) \in R^+, \alpha$, $(\exists x \in d A)^{(\exists \lambda|\alpha)}$ denotes the result of restricting the *outermost existential quantifier* $\exists x \in d$ to $\exists x \in L_\alpha$, $(\exists x \in d A)^{(\exists \lambda|\alpha)} \equiv (\exists x \in L_\alpha A)$.

In what follows $F_{x,\lambda}$ denotes $F_{x,\lambda}^{\Sigma_1}$ when $\lambda \in R$, and $F_x^{\Sigma_n}$ when $\lambda = I$.

Lemma 4.21 (Boundedness)

Let $\lambda \in R^+$, $C \equiv (\exists x \in d A)$ and $C \notin \{\exists x < \lambda \exists y < \lambda [\alpha < x \wedge P(\lambda, x, y)] : \alpha < \lambda \in R\} \cup \{\exists x < I [\alpha < x \wedge P_{I,n}(x)] : \alpha < I\}$. Assume that $\text{rk}(C) = \lambda = \text{rk}_L(d)$.

1.

$$(\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \lambda, n) \vdash_c^a \Lambda, C \& a \leq b \in \mathcal{H} \cap \lambda \Rightarrow (\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \lambda, n) \vdash_c^a \Lambda, C^{(\exists \lambda^b)}.$$

2.

$$(\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \kappa, n) \vdash_c^a \Lambda, \neg C \& b \in \mathcal{H} \cap \lambda \Rightarrow (\mathcal{H}, \Theta, \kappa, n) \vdash_c^a \Lambda, \neg(C^{(\exists \lambda^b)}).$$

The following Lemma 4.22(Collapsing down to I) is seen as in Lemma 5.22(Collapsing) of [7].

Recall that

$$(\mathcal{H}, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^a \Gamma :\Leftrightarrow (\mathcal{H}, \emptyset, \kappa, n) \vdash_b^a \Gamma$$

Lemma 4.22 (Collapsing down to I)

Suppose $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta]$ with $\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}(\Psi_{I,n}\gamma)$, and

$$\Gamma \subset \Sigma^{\Sigma_{n+1}}(I)$$

Then for $\hat{a} = \gamma + \omega^{I+a}$

$$(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta], I, n) \vdash_{I+1}^a \Gamma \Rightarrow (\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1,n}[\Theta], I, n) \vdash_{\Psi_{I,n}\hat{a}}^{\Psi_{I,n}\hat{a}} \Gamma.$$

Proof by induction on a .

First note that $\Psi_{I,n}\hat{a} \in \mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1,n}[\Theta] = \mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1,n}(\Theta)$ since $\hat{a} = \gamma + \omega^{I+a} \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta] \subset \mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1,n}[\Theta]$ by the assumption, $\{\gamma, a\} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta]$.

Assume $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta][\Lambda], I, n) \vdash_{I+1}^{a_0} \Gamma_0$ with $\Lambda \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}(\Psi_{I,n}\gamma)$. Then by $\gamma \leq \hat{a}$, we have $\hat{a}_0 \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta][\Lambda] \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}(\Psi_{I,n}\gamma) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\hat{a},n}(\Psi_{I,n}\hat{a})$. This yields that

$$a_0 < a \Rightarrow \Psi_{I,n}\hat{a}_0 < \Psi_{I,n}\hat{a} \quad (8)$$

Second observe that $\mathbf{k}_{\mathcal{K}}^E(\Gamma) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta] \subset \mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1,n}[\Theta]$ by $\gamma \leq \hat{a} + 1$.

Third we have

$$\mathbf{k}_{\mathcal{K}}^E(\Gamma) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}(\Psi_{I,n}\gamma) \quad (9)$$

Case 1. First consider the case: $\Gamma \ni A \simeq \bigwedge \{A_\iota : \iota \in J\}$

$$\frac{\{(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta \cup \{\text{rk}_L(\iota)\}], I, n) \vdash_{I+1}^{a(\iota)} \Gamma, A_\iota : \iota \in J\}}{(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta], I, n) \vdash_{I+1}^a \Gamma} (\bigwedge)$$

where $a(\iota) < a$ for any $\iota \in J$.

We claim that

$$\forall \iota \in J (\text{rk}_L(\iota) \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}(\Psi_{I,n}\gamma)) \quad (10)$$

Consider the case when $A \equiv \forall x \in b \neg A'$. There are two cases to consider. First consider the case when $J = \{d\}$ for the set $d = \mu x \in b A'$. Then $\mathbf{k}_{\mathcal{K}}^E(A) = \mathbf{k}(A)$, and $\iota = d = (\mu x \in b A') \in \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_n}^I(\mathbf{k}(A))$, and $\text{rk}_L(\iota) \in \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_n}^I(\mathbf{k}(A)) \subset$

$\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}(\Psi_{I,n}\gamma)$ by (9). Otherwise we have $J = b$ and either $A \in \Sigma_0^1(\mathcal{K}^+)$ and $b \in L_{\mathcal{K}^+} \cup \{L_{\mathcal{K}^+}\}$, or $\text{rk}_L(b) < I$. In the second case we have $b \in \mathbf{k}(A) = \mathbf{k}_{\mathcal{K}}^E(A) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta]$. In the first case each $\iota \in b$ has L -rank $\text{rk}_L(\iota) < \mathcal{K}^+$. On the other hand we have $\mathcal{K}^+ \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}(\Psi_{I,n}\gamma) \cap I \subset \Psi_{I,n}\gamma$ by $I > \mathcal{K}^+$. Thus $\text{rk}_L(\iota) < \Psi_{I,n}\gamma$. In the second case we have $\text{rk}_L(\iota) \leq \text{rk}_L(b) \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}(\Psi_{I,n}\gamma) \cap I \subset \Psi_{I,n}\gamma$ by $\text{rk}_L(b) < I$.

Hence (10) was shown.

SIH yields

$$\frac{\{(\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{a(\iota)+1,n}}[\Theta \cup \{\text{rk}_L(\iota)\}], I, n) \vdash_{\Psi_{I,n}\widehat{a(\iota)}}^{\Psi_{I,n}\widehat{a(\iota)}} \Gamma, A_\iota : \iota \in J\}}{(\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{a+1,n}}[\Theta], I, n) \vdash_{\Psi_{I,n}\widehat{a}}^{\Psi_{I,n}\widehat{a}} \Gamma} (\wedge)$$

for $\widehat{a(\iota)} = \gamma + \omega^{I+a(\iota)}$, since $\Psi_{I,n}\widehat{a(\iota)} < \Psi_{I,n}\widehat{a}$ by (8).

Case 2. Next consider the case for an $A \simeq \bigvee \{A_\iota : \iota \in J\} \in \Gamma$ and an $\iota \in J$ with $a(\iota) < a$ and $\text{rk}_L(\iota) < I \Rightarrow \text{rk}_L(\iota) < a$

$$\frac{(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta], I, n) \vdash_{I+1}^{a(\iota)} \Gamma, A_\iota}{(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta], I, n) \vdash_{I+1}^a \Gamma} (\vee)$$

Assume $\text{rk}_L(\iota) < I$. We show $\text{rk}_L(\iota) < \Psi_{I,n}\widehat{a}$. By $\Psi_{I,n}\gamma \leq \Psi_{I,n}\widehat{a}$, it suffices to show $\text{rk}_L(\iota) < \Psi_{I,n}\gamma$.

Consider the case when $A \equiv \exists x \in b A'$. There are two cases to consider. First consider the case when $J = \{d\}$ for the set $d = \mu x \in b A'$. Then $\mathbf{k}_{\mathcal{K}}^E(A) = \mathbf{k}(A)$, and $\iota = d = (\mu x \in b A') \in \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_n}^I(\mathbf{k}(A))$, and $\text{rk}_L(\iota) \in \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_n}^I(\mathbf{k}(A)) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}(\Psi_{I,n}\gamma)$ by (9). If $\text{rk}_L(\iota) < I$, then $\text{rk}_L(\iota) \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}(\Psi_{I,n}\gamma) \cap I \subset \Psi_{I,n}\gamma$.

Otherwise we have $J = b$, and either $A \in \Sigma_0^1(\mathcal{K}^+)$ and $b \in L_{\mathcal{K}^+} \cup \{L_{\mathcal{K}^+}\}$, or $b \in \mathbf{k}(A) = \mathbf{k}_{\mathcal{K}}^E(A) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta]$. In the second case we can assume that $\iota \in \mathbf{k}(A_\iota) = \mathbf{k}_{\mathcal{K}}^E(A_\iota) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta]$. Otherwise set $\iota = 0$.

In the first case each $\iota \in b$ has L -rank $\text{rk}_L(\iota) < \mathcal{K}^+$. On the other hand we have $\mathcal{K}^+ \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}(\Psi_{I,n}\gamma) \cap I \subset \Psi_{I,n}\gamma$ by $I > \mathcal{K}^+$. Thus $\text{rk}_L(\iota) < \Psi_{I,n}\gamma$. In the second case we have $\text{rk}_L(\iota) < \text{rk}_L(b) \leq I$, and $\text{rk}_L(\iota) \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}(\Psi_{I,n}\gamma) \cap I \subset \Psi_{I,n}\gamma$.

SIH yields for $\widehat{a(\iota)} = \gamma + \omega^{I+a(\iota)}$

$$\frac{(\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{a(\iota)+1,n}}[\Theta], I, n) \vdash_{\Psi_{I,n}\widehat{a(\iota)}}^{\Psi_{I,n}\widehat{a(\iota)}} \Gamma, A_\iota}{(\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{a+1,n}}[\Theta], I, n) \vdash_{\Psi_{I,n}\widehat{a}}^{\Psi_{I,n}\widehat{a}} \Gamma} (\vee)$$

Case 3. Third consider the case for an $a_0 < a$ and a C with $\text{rk}(C) < I + 1$.

$$\frac{(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta], I, n) \vdash_{I+1}^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg C \quad (\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta], I, n) \vdash_{I+1}^{a_0} C, \Gamma}{(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta], I, n) \vdash_{I+1}^a \Gamma} (cut)$$

Case 3.1. $\text{rk}(C) < I$.

We have by (9) $k_K^E(C) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}(\Psi_{I,n}\gamma)$. Proposition 4.9.4 yields $\text{rk}(C) \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}(\Psi_{I,n}\gamma) \cap I \subset \Psi_{I,n}\gamma \leq \Psi_{I,n}\hat{a}$. By Proposition 4.9.2 we see that $\{\neg C, C\} \subset \Sigma^{\Sigma_{n+1}}(I)$.

SIH yields for $\hat{a}_0 = \gamma + \omega^{I+a_0}$

$$\frac{(\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}_0+1,n}[\Theta], I, n) \vdash_{\Psi_{I,n}\hat{a}_0}^{\Psi_{I,n}\hat{a}_0} \Gamma, \neg C \quad (\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}_0+1,n}[\Theta], I, n) \vdash_{\Psi_{I,n}\hat{a}_0}^{\Psi_{I,n}\hat{a}_0} C, \Gamma}{(\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1,n}[\Theta], I, n) \vdash_{\Psi_{I,n}\hat{a}}^{\Psi_{I,n}\hat{a}} \Gamma} \text{ (cut)}$$

Case 3.2. $\text{rk}(C) = I$.

Then $C \in \Sigma^{\Sigma_{n+1}}(I)$. C is either a sentence $\exists x < I[\alpha < x \wedge P_{I,n}(x)]$, or a sentence $\exists x \in L_I A(x)$ with $\text{qk}(A) < I$.

In the first case we have $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma+1,n}[\Theta], I, n) \vdash_{I+1}^{a_0} \Gamma$ by Reduction 4.18.3, and IH yields the lemma.

Consider the second case. From the right uppersequent, SIH yields for $\hat{a}_0 = \gamma + \omega^{I+a_0}$ and $\beta_0 = \Psi_{I,n}\hat{a}_0 \in \mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}_0+1,n}[\Theta]$

$$(\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}_0+1,n}[\Theta], I, n) \vdash_{\beta_0}^{\beta_0} C, \Gamma$$

Then by Boundedness 4.21.1 and $\beta_0 \in \mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}_0+1,n}[\Theta]$, we have

$$(\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}_0+1,n}[\Theta], I, n) \vdash_{\beta_0}^{\beta_0} C^{(\exists I\beta_0)}, \Gamma$$

On the other hand we have by Boundedness 4.21.2 from the left uppersequent

$$(\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}_0+1,n}[\Theta], I, n) \vdash_{\mu}^{a_0} \Gamma, \neg(C^{(\exists I\beta_0)})$$

Moreover we have $\neg(C^{(\exists I\beta_0)}) \in \Sigma^{\Sigma_{n+1}}(I)$. SIH yields for $\hat{a}_0 < \hat{a}_1 = \hat{a}_0 + 1 + \omega^{I+a_0} = \gamma + \omega^{I+a_0} + 1 + \omega^{I+a_0} < \gamma + \omega^{I+a} = \hat{a}$ and $\beta_1 = \Psi_{I,n}\hat{a}_1$

$$(\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}_1+1,n}[\Theta], I, n) \vdash_{\beta_1}^{\beta_1} \Gamma, \neg(C^{(\exists I\beta_0)})$$

Now we have $\hat{a}_i \in \mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}_i,n}(\Psi_{I,n}\hat{a})$ and $\hat{a}_i < \hat{a}$ for $i < 2$, and hence $\beta_0 = \Psi_{I,n}\hat{a}_0 < \beta_1 = \Psi_{I,n}\hat{a}_1 < \Psi_{I,n}\hat{a}$. Therefore $\text{rk}(C^{(\exists I\beta_0)}) < \beta_1 < \Psi_{I,n}\hat{a}$.

Consequently

$$\frac{(\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}_1+1,n}[\Theta], I, n) \vdash_{\beta_1}^{\beta_1} \Gamma, \neg(C^{(\exists I\beta_0)}) \quad (\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}_0+1,n}[\Theta], I, n) \vdash_{\beta_0}^{\beta_0} C^{(\exists I\beta_0)}, \Gamma}{(\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1,n}[\Theta], I, n) \vdash_{\beta_1}^{\beta_1+1} \Gamma} \text{ (cut)}$$

Hence $(\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1,n}, I, n) \vdash_{\Psi_{I,n}\hat{a}}^{\Psi_{I,n}\hat{a}} \Gamma$.

Case 4. Fourth consider the case for an $a_0 < a$

$$\frac{(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta], I, n) \vdash_{I+1}^{a_0} \Lambda, \Gamma_0}{(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta], I, n) \vdash_{I+1}^a \Gamma} \text{ (F)}$$

where $\Gamma = \Lambda \cup F''\Gamma_0$ and either $F = F_{x \cup \{\rho\}}^{\Sigma_1}$, $\Gamma_0 \subset \Sigma_1$ for some x and ρ , or $F = F_x^{\Sigma_n}$, $\Gamma_0 \subset \Sigma_n$ for an x . Then $\Lambda \cup \Gamma_0 \subset \Sigma_n$. SIH yields the lemma. $\square$

4.3 Elimination of Π_1^1 -indescribability

In the subsection we eliminate inferences (**Ref**_K) for Π_1^1 -indescribability.

For second-order sentences φ on L_π with parameters $A \subset L_\pi$ and ordinals $\alpha < \pi$, $\varphi^{(\alpha, \pi)}$ denotes the result of replacing second-order quantifiers $\exists X \subset L_\pi, \forall X \subset L_\pi$ by $\exists X \subset L_\alpha, \forall X \subset L_\alpha$, first-order quantifiers $\exists x \in L_\pi, \forall x \in L_\pi$ by $\exists x \in L_\alpha, \forall x \in L_\alpha$ and the parameters A by $A \cap L_\alpha$. For sequents Γ , $\Gamma^{(\alpha, \pi)} := \{\varphi^{(\alpha, \pi)} : \varphi \in \Gamma\}$.

Proposition 4.23 *Let $\Gamma \subset \Pi_1^1(\pi)$ for $\pi \in Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta]$. Assume*

$$\exists \xi \in \mathcal{H}_{\xi, n}[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}](\pi) \cap \alpha \forall \rho \in Mh_n^\xi[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}](\Gamma^{(\rho, \pi)}).$$

Then Γ is true.

Proof. By $\pi \in Mh_n^\alpha[\Theta]$ we have $\pi \in M(Mh_n^\xi[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}])$ for any $\xi \in \mathcal{H}_{\xi, n}[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}](\pi) \cap \alpha$.

Suppose the $\Sigma_1^1(\pi)$ -sentence $\varphi := \bigwedge \neg \Gamma := \bigwedge \{\neg \theta : \theta \in \Gamma\}$ is true. Then the set $\{\rho < \pi : \varphi^{(\rho, \pi)}\}$ is club in π .

Hence for any $\xi \in \mathcal{H}_{\xi, n}[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}](\pi) \cap \alpha$ we can pick a $\rho \in Mh_n^\xi[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}]$ such that $\varphi^{(\rho, \pi)}$. $\square$

$$\mathcal{H}_{\gamma, n}[\Theta] \vdash_b^a \Gamma \Leftrightarrow (\mathcal{H}_{\gamma, n}, \Theta, I, n) \vdash_b^a \Gamma.$$

Lemma 4.24 (Collapsing down to $\mathcal{K}$)

Let γ be an ordinal such that $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma, n}$.

Suppose for a finite set Θ of ordinals and an ordinal a

$$\mathcal{H}_{\gamma, n}[\Theta] \vdash_0^a \Gamma$$

where Γ consists of sentences $\neg \tau(B, \mathcal{K})$, $(B \cap C \neq \emptyset)$, $\forall \rho < \mathcal{K} \tau(B, \rho)$ for a $B \subset \mathcal{K}$ with $B \in \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(\{\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}^+\})$ and sets $C \in L_{\mathcal{K}+1}$ such that C is a club subset of $\mathcal{K}$, and their subformulas:

$$\tau(B, \rho) := \exists C \subset \rho (C \text{ is club})^\rho \wedge B \cap C = \emptyset \quad (4)$$

Then for $\xi = \gamma + a$

$$\forall \pi \in Mh_n^\xi[\Theta] \{\models \Gamma^{(\pi, \mathcal{K})}\}.$$

which means that $\bigvee (\Gamma^{(\pi, \mathcal{K})})$ is true for any $\pi \in Mh_n^\xi[\Theta]$.

Proof by induction on a . Let $\pi \in Mh_n^\xi[\Theta]$ and $\xi = \gamma + a$.

Case 1. First consider the case when the last inference is a (**Ref**_K): we have $\max\{a_\ell, a_r\} < a$ and $B \subset \mathcal{K}$ with $B \in \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(\{\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}^+\})$.

$$\frac{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta] \vdash_0^{a_\ell} \Gamma, \neg\tau(B, \mathcal{K}) \quad \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta] \vdash_0^{a_r} \Gamma, \forall \rho < \mathcal{K} \tau(B, \rho)}{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta] \vdash_0^a \Gamma} \text{ (Ref}_{\mathcal{K}}\text{)}$$

We have $\xi_r := \gamma + a_r \in \mathcal{H}_{\eta_r,n}[\Theta](\pi) \cap \xi$ by $\xi_r \geq \gamma$ and $a_r < a$. By Proposition 2.9.3 with $\xi_r \in \mathcal{H}_{\xi_r,n}[\Theta](\pi)$ we have $\pi \in Mh_n^{\xi_r}[\Theta]$. IH yields $\Gamma^{(\pi, \mathcal{K})} \vee \forall \rho < \pi \tau(B, \rho)$.

On the other hand we have $\xi_\ell := \gamma + a_\ell \in \mathcal{H}_{\xi_\ell,n}[\Theta](\pi) \cap \xi$. By IH we have for any $\rho \in Mh_n^{\xi_\ell}[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}] \cap \pi$, $\Gamma^{(\rho, \mathcal{K})} \vee \neg\tau(B, \rho)$. Hence we have $\forall \rho \in Mh_n^{\xi_\ell}[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}] \cap \pi \{\Gamma^{(\rho, \mathcal{K})} \vee \Gamma^{(\pi, \mathcal{K})}\}$. Proposition 4.23 yields $\Gamma^{(\pi, \mathcal{K})}$.

Case 2. Second consider the case when the last inference introduces a $\Pi_1^1(\mathcal{K})$ -sentence $\neg\tau(B, \mathcal{K})$ with a $B \subset \mathcal{K}$ such that $B \in \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(\{\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}^+\})$.

$$\frac{\{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta \cup \{\text{rk}_L(C)\}]\} \vdash_0^{a(C)} \Gamma, C \not\subset \mathcal{K} \vee \neg(C \text{ is club})^{\mathcal{K}} \vee B \cap C \neq \emptyset : C \in L_{\mathcal{K}^+}}{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta] \vdash_0^a \Gamma, \neg\tau(B, \mathcal{K})} (\wedge)$$

where $\forall C \in L_{\mathcal{K}^+} (a(C) < a)$ and $\neg\tau(B, \mathcal{K}) \simeq \bigwedge \{C \not\subset \mathcal{K} \vee \neg(C \text{ is club})^{\mathcal{K}} \vee B \cap C \neq \emptyset : C \in L_{\mathcal{K}^+}\}$. For each C , $C \not\subset \mathcal{K} \vee \neg(C \text{ is club})^{\mathcal{K}} \vee B \cap C \neq \emptyset$ is stratified with respect to C .

Let

$$C_\pi := \mu C \in L_{\pi^+} [C \subset \pi \wedge (C \text{ is club})^\pi \wedge B \cap C = \emptyset]$$

Then $\neg[C_\pi \subset \pi \wedge (C_\pi \text{ is club})^\pi \wedge B \cap C_\pi = \emptyset] \Rightarrow \neg\tau(B, \pi) \equiv (\neg\tau(B, \mathcal{K}))^{(\pi, \mathcal{K})}$.

We can assume that $C_\pi \subset \pi \wedge (C_\pi \text{ is club})^\pi$. Otherwise $(\neg\tau(B, \mathcal{K}))^{(\pi, \mathcal{K})}$ and hence $\Gamma^{(\pi, \mathcal{K})} \vee (\neg\tau(B, \mathcal{K}))^{(\pi, \mathcal{K})}$.

Let

$$C = \{\gamma \in \mathcal{K} : \exists x, y < \mathcal{K} (\gamma = \pi \cdot x + y \wedge y \in C_\pi \cup \{0\})\}$$

Then C is an $L_{\mathcal{K}}$ -definable club subset of $\mathcal{K}$, $C \in L_{\mathcal{K}+1}$, and $C \in J \cap \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(\{\pi, \pi^+, \mathcal{K}, B\}) \subset \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(\{\pi, \pi^+, \mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}^+\}) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}]$, and by inversion

$$\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}] \vdash_0^{a(C)} \Gamma, C \not\subset \mathcal{K}, \neg(C \text{ is club})^{\mathcal{K}}, B \cap C \neq \emptyset$$

Eliminate false sentences $C \not\subset \mathcal{K}$ and $\neg(C \text{ is club})^{\mathcal{K}}$ by Lemma 4.15.

$$\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}] \vdash_0^{a(C)} \Gamma, B \cap C \neq \emptyset$$

IH yields for $\xi(C) = \gamma + a(C)$, $\forall \rho \in Mh_n^{\xi(C)}[\Theta \cup \{\pi\}] \cap \pi \{\Gamma^{(\rho, \mathcal{K})} \vee (B \cap C \neq \emptyset)^{(\rho, \mathcal{K})}\}$, where $(B \cap C \neq \emptyset)^{(\rho, \mathcal{K})} \equiv (B \cap C_\pi \cap \rho \neq \emptyset) \equiv ((B \cap C \neq \emptyset)^{(\pi, \mathcal{K})})^{(\rho, \pi)}$. Proposition 4.23 yields $\Gamma^{(\pi, \mathcal{K})} \vee (B \cap C \neq \emptyset)^{(\pi, \mathcal{K})}$, and hence $\Gamma^{(\pi, \mathcal{K})} \vee (\neg\tau(B, \mathcal{K}))^{(\pi, \mathcal{K})}$.

Case 3. Third consider the case : $\Gamma \ni (B \cap C \neq \emptyset)$ with $B \subset \mathcal{K}$, $B \in \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(\{\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}^+\})$ and a club subset C of $\mathcal{K}$.

$$\frac{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta] \vdash_0^{a_0} \Gamma, (d \in B) \wedge (d \in C)}{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta] \vdash_0^a \Gamma} (\vee)$$

where $a_0 < a$ and $d \in \mathcal{K}$.

Then $(B \cap C \neq \emptyset)^{(\pi, \mathcal{K})} \leftrightarrow (B \cap C \cap \pi \neq \emptyset)$ and $((d \in B) \wedge (d \in C))^{(\pi, \mathcal{K})} \leftrightarrow (d \in (B \cap \pi)) \wedge (d \in (C \cap \pi))$. IH with Proposition 2.9.3 yields the lemma.

Case 4. Fourth consider the case : $\Gamma \ni ((d \in B) \wedge (d \in C))$ with $B \subset \mathcal{K}$, $B \in \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(\{\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}^+\})$ and a club subset C of $\mathcal{K}$.

$$\frac{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta] \vdash_0^{a_0} \Gamma, d \in B \quad \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta] \vdash_0^{a_1} \Gamma, d \in C}{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta] \vdash_0^a \Gamma} (\wedge)$$

where $a_0, a_1 < a$.

IH with Proposition 2.9.3 yields the lemma.

Case 5. Fifth consider the case: for a true literal $M \equiv (d \in B)$, $M \in \Gamma$, where $B \subset \mathcal{K}$ such that either $B \in \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(\{\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}^+\})$, or B is a club subset of $\mathcal{K}$, and $d \in \mathcal{K}$.

$$\overline{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta] \vdash_0^a \Gamma} (\wedge)$$

Then $M^{(\pi, \mathcal{K})} \equiv (d \in (B \cap \pi)) \in \Gamma^{(\pi, \mathcal{K})}$.

It suffices to show $d = \text{rk}_L(d) < \pi$. We have by (7) $d \in \text{k}^E(d \in B) \cap \mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n} \cap \mathcal{K} \subset \pi$ by $\pi \in \text{Mh}_n^\xi[\Theta]$, i.e., by $\mathcal{H}_{\xi,n}(\pi) \cap \mathcal{K} \subset \pi$.

Case 6. Sixth consider the case when the last inference introduces a $\Pi_1(\mathcal{K})$ -sentence $\forall \rho < \mathcal{K} \tau(B, \rho)$.

$$\frac{\{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\{\rho\}][\Theta] \vdash_0^{a(\rho)} \Gamma, \tau(B, \rho) : \rho < \mathcal{K}\}}{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta] \vdash_0^a \Gamma, \forall \rho < \mathcal{K} \tau(B, \rho)} (\wedge)$$

We have for any $\rho < \pi$ and $\xi(\rho) = \gamma + a(\rho)$, $\xi(\rho) \in \mathcal{H}_{\xi(\rho),n}[\Theta](\pi)$. Proposition 2.9.3 yields $\pi \in \text{Mh}_n^{\xi(\rho)}[\Theta]$. By IH we have $\forall \rho < \pi \{\Gamma^{(\pi, \mathcal{K})} \vee \tau(B, \rho)\}$, and hence $(\Gamma \vee \forall \rho < \mathcal{K} \tau(B, \rho))^{(\pi, \mathcal{K})}$ with $(\forall \rho < \mathcal{K} \tau(B, \rho))^{(\pi, \mathcal{K})} \equiv \forall \rho < \pi \tau(B, \rho)$.

Case 7. Seventh consider the case when the last inference introduces a $\Delta_0(\mathcal{K})$ -sentence $\forall x \in c \varphi(x) \in \Gamma$ for $c \in L_{\mathcal{K}}$.

$$\frac{\{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\{\text{rk}_L(b)\}][\Theta] \vdash_0^{a(\rho)} \Gamma, \varphi(b) : b \in c\}}{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta] \vdash_0^a \Gamma} (\wedge)$$

Then $\gamma = \text{rk}_L(c) \in \text{k}^E(\Gamma) \cap \mathcal{K}$ and hence $\gamma < \pi$ as in **Case 5**. As in **Case 6** we have by IH $\forall b \in c(\Gamma^{(\pi, \mathcal{K})} \vee \varphi(b))$ where $\varphi(b) \equiv (\varphi(b))^{(\pi, \mathcal{K})}$. Hence $\Gamma^{(\pi, \mathcal{K})}$.

Case 8. Eighth consider the case when the last inference introduces a $\Delta_0(\mathcal{K})$ -sentence $\exists x \in c \varphi(c) \in \Gamma$ for $c \in L_{\mathcal{K}}$ and $b \in c$.

$$\frac{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta] \vdash_0^{a_0} \Gamma, \varphi(b)}{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}[\Theta] \vdash_0^a \Gamma} \quad (\vee)$$

As in **Case 7** we see $\text{rk}_L(c) < \pi$. IH with Proposition 2.9.3 yields $\Gamma^{(\pi, \mathcal{K})} \vee \varphi(b)$, and $\Gamma^{(\pi, \mathcal{K})}$.

Case 9. Ninth consider the case when the last inference is an **(F)** where either $F = F_{x \cup \{\lambda\}}^{\Sigma_1}$ for a $\lambda \in R$ or $F = F_x^{\Sigma_n}$.

In each case if $A \in \text{rng}(F)$ for an $A \in \Gamma$, then we claim $F'' A \equiv A$. Suppose $x = F_{x \cup \{\mathcal{K}^+\}}^{\Sigma_1}(\mathcal{K}^+) \leq \text{rk}_L(B) < \mathcal{K}^+$ for the set $B \in \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(\{\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}^+\})$. However by $x > \mathcal{K}$ we have $\text{rk}_L(B) \in \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(\{\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}^+\}) \cap \mathcal{K}^+ \subset \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(x \cup \{\mathcal{K}^+\}) \cap \mathcal{K}^+ \subset x$. Hence this is not the case.

IH yields the assertion. $\square$

Collapsing down to $\mathcal{K}$ 4.24 yields the following Theorem 4.25.

Theorem 4.25 (Elimination of **(Ref_K)**)

Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n}$, $B \subset \mathcal{K}$, and $B \in \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(\{\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}^+\})$.

$$[\mathcal{H}_{\gamma,n} \vdash_{\mathcal{K}^{++1}}^a \neg \tau(B, \mathcal{K})] \Rightarrow [\neg \tau(B, \pi) \text{ is true}].$$

for any $\pi \in Mh_n^\xi$ with $\xi = \gamma + a$.

5 Proof of Theorem 1.3

Let φ be a Σ_2^1 -sentence, and assume that ZF proves the sentence

$$\forall \mathcal{K} [\mathcal{K} \text{ is a weakly compact cardinal} \rightarrow \varphi^{V_{\mathcal{K}}}]$$

Under $V = L$, $V_\sigma = L_\sigma$ for any inaccessible cardinals σ , and we have $\forall \mathcal{K} [\mathcal{K} \text{ is a weakly compact cardinal} \rightarrow \varphi^{L_{\mathcal{K}}}]$. Hence $T(\mathcal{K}, I) \vdash \varphi^{L_{\mathcal{K}}}$. By Proposition 1.2 we can assume that the sentence ‘ $\mathcal{K}$ is uncountable regular’ $\rightarrow \varphi^{L_{\mathcal{K}}}$ is of the form ‘ $\exists B \subset \mathcal{K} (S^\varphi(B) \cap \mathcal{K} \text{ is stationary in } \mathcal{K})$ ’.

Let $B := \mu B \subset \mathcal{K} (S^\varphi(B) \cap \mathcal{K} \text{ is stationary in } \mathcal{K}) \in \text{Hull}_{\Sigma_1}^I(\{\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}^+\})$.

In what follows work under $\mathcal{K} \in Mh_n^{\omega_n(I+1)}$ over $\text{ZF} + (V = L)$ for a sufficiently large $n < \omega$. By Embedding 4.16 pick an $m < \omega$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_{0,n}, I, n) \vdash_{I+m-1}^{I \cdot (m-1)} \neg \tau(B, \mathcal{K})$. By Predicative Cut-elimination 4.19 we have $(\mathcal{H}_{0,n}, I, n) \vdash_{I+1}^{\omega_{m-2}(I \cdot (m-1))} \neg \tau(B, \mathcal{K})$.

Then by Collapsing down to I 4.22 we have for $a = \omega_m(I+1)$ and $b = \Psi_{I,n}a$, $(\mathcal{H}_{a,n}, I, n) \vdash_b^b \neg \tau(B, \mathcal{K})$. Again by Predicative Cut-elimination 4.19 we have $(\mathcal{H}_{a,n}, I, n) \vdash_0^{\varphi^{bb}} \neg \tau(B, \mathcal{K})$.

Elimination of $(\mathbf{Ref}_K)$ 4.25 yields $\neg\tau(B, \pi)$ for any $\pi \in Mh_n^\xi$ with $\xi = a + \varphi bb \in \mathcal{H}_{\xi, n}(K) \cap \omega_{m+1}(I+1)$.

Proposition 4.23 with $K \in Mh_n^{\omega_{m+1}(I+1)}$ yields $\neg\tau(B, K)$, and hence $S^\varphi(B) \cap K$ is stationary in K .

Therefore φ^{V_K} follows from $\theta_n(K) : \Leftrightarrow K \in Mh_n^{\omega_n(I+1)}$ over $\mathbf{ZF} + (V = L)$. Thus Theorem 1.3.2 was shown.

Since the least weakly inaccessible cardinal I_0 is below the least weakly Mahlo cardinal,

$$\mathbf{ZF} + \mathbb{K} \vdash \varphi^{V_{I_0}} \Rightarrow \mathbf{ZF} + \{\exists K \theta_n(K) : n < \omega\} \vdash \varphi^{V_{I_0}}$$

for any first-order sentence φ , etc.

This completes a proof of Theorem 1.3.

References

- [1] T. Arai, Ordinal diagrams for Π_3 -reflection, Jour. Symb. Logic vol. 65 (2000), 1375-1394.
- [2] T. Arai, Proof theory for theories of ordinals I: recursively Mahlo ordinals, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic 122 (2003) 1-85.
- [3] T. Arai, Proof theory for theories of ordinals II: Π_3 -Reflection, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic vol. 129 (2004), 39-92.
- [4] T. Arai, Wellfoundedness proofs by means of non-monotonic inductive definitions I: Π_2^0 -operators, Jour. Symb. Logic vol. 69 (2004), 830-850.
- [5] T. Arai, Epsilon substitution method for Π_2^0 -FIX, Jour. Symb. Logic vol. 71(2006), 1155-1188.
- [6] T. Arai, Iterating the recursively Mahlo operations, in Proceedings of the thirteenth International Congress of Logic Methodology, Philosophy of Science, Ed. by C. Glymour, W. Wei and D. Westerstaahl, College Publications, King's College London (2009), pp. 21-35.
- [7] T. Arai, Lifting up the proof theory to the countables: Zermelo-Fraenkel's set theory, submitted. arXiv:1101.5660.
- [8] T. Arai, Conservations of first-order reflections, arXiv:1204.0205.
- [9] J. Baumgartner, A. Taylor and S. Wagon, On splitting stationary subsets of large cardinals, Jour. Symb. Logic 42(1977), 203-214.
- [10] W. Buchholz, A simplified version of local predicativity, P. H. G. Aczel, H. Simmons and S. S. Wainer(eds.), Proof Theory, Cambridge UP, 1992, pp. 115-147.

- [11] R. Jensen, The fine structure of the constructible hierarchy, *Ann. Math. Logic* 4(1972), 229-308.
- [12] M. Rathjen, Proof theory of reflection, *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* 68 (1994), 181-224.